

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1889.

I.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

BY REV. W. RUPP, D.D.

THE development of theological thought, in the course of past ages, has produced a number of distinct theories of the atonement, none of which, however, commends itself as entirely satisfactory to the Christian mind of the present day. These theories, though mutually contradictory, have indeed all at some time been held and defended by earnest and good Christian men, and they may still be regarded as each containing important elements of truth; yet few Christian scholars would now be willing to accept any one of them as an adequate and final expression of the whole truth. There exists at the present moment a very wide difference of opinion, and a general desire for a better and more Christian statement of the doctrine in question than any that has yet been given.

Some, indeed, despair of the possibility of any statement of this doctrine that shall be satisfactory to the reason. Lotze, for example, in the last chapter of his work on the *Philosophy*

of Religion, says: "He who in an unprejudiced way allows the teaching of Christ and the history of Christ's life to influence his mind, without analyzing this impression, may be convinced that an infinitely valuable and unique act has occurred here on earth for the salvation of humanity. But the attempts to settle speculatively the content and value of this fact, do not as a whole lead to the end designed."

If this judgment were understood to apply merely to the speculative efforts of the past, whose results are embodied, for instance, in the patristic notion of the death of Christ as a ransom paid to the devil, or in the Anselmic doctrine of vicarious punishment for the satisfaction of God's honor, or in Abelard's theory of moral influence, or in the governmental theory of Grotius, then we should be in entire accord with it; but as it is intended to apply to all possible efforts of the human mind to construe the doctrine in accordance with rational principles, we are bound to dissent. While we recognize the limitation and weakness of the human mind, we have no sympathy with any sort of theological agnosticism. And, certainly, they who deprecate speculation on this subject because of the weakness and fallibility of the human mind, have no right to undertake to bind us to the acceptance of any of the theories of the past, like that of Anselm, for example; for these also are products of the human mind, and nothing more. But while dissatisfied with the results of the past, we believe that the Christian mind will renew its attempts from time to time, and go on advancing, until a satisfactory result shall have been reached. We believe that Christianity is in the highest sense rational, and that the human mind, enlightened by the Spirit of the Gospel, is capable of comprehending this rationality; and hence we believe that Christianity will ultimately justify itself in all its parts to the reason and conscience of men. The doctrine of the atonement must, therefore, be capable of such development as shall satisfy not only the statements of Scripture, but also the demands of logic and of the moral sense. And we believe that the conditions of such a development of

the doctrine are given in the *Christological way of thinking*, which distinguishes the living theology of the present day. In the following pages, accordingly, an effort will be made to develop a theory of the atonement from the *Christological standpoint* of modern theology. We say *a* theory, for we are not so presumptuous as to imagine that we shall be able to unfold the theory of the subject in its absolute and final form. What we hope to be able to do is simply to present a view that, because of its sympathetic relation to the living Christian thought of the present day, shall appear to ourselves at least, and we trust to many others also, as better, truer, and more Christian than any of the theories belonging to earlier stages of theological activity.*

The distinguishing characteristic of the modern Christological theology is that the conception of God is derived, not from the feelings and ideas of the natural mind, whether as embodied in philosophy or religion, but from the self-revelation of God in Christ. The natural sense or consciousness of God, which is innate in all men, cannot be a sufficient source of a true knowledge of God and of His character, because the human mind is in an imperfect or abnormal condition. Hence in order to know God truly we must not look to the speculations of philosophers, nor to the religious ideas and practices of heathenism, or even of Judaism, but to the person and history of Christ.† But in Christ God has revealed Himself

* For modern views of the doctrine of the atonement, in more or less agreement with those contained in this paper, the reader is referred to the article *Versöhnung*, by Schoeberlein, in Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, in which the subject is treated on the same general principles as here; also to *The Orthodox Theology of To-Day*, by Newman Smyth, pp. 61-82; and to two articles on *Paul's Theology*, by Dr. Lyman Abbott, in the November and December numbers of the Andover Review for 1887. For some of the views concerning the being of God presented in this paper we are indebted to Liebner's *Entstehung zur Christologischen Theologie*, which we studied years ago, but to which, as we had no copy at hand during the preparation of this paper, we could make no special references.

† This caution is forgotten when it is proposed to derive the Christian doctrine of the atonement from the conceptions of sacrifice and propitiation which

as *absolute love*; and from this thought, rather than from the notion of a dualism in the being of God, or from the idea of the sovereignty of God, must proceed a development of the doctrine of atonement that shall satisfy the most advanced Christian reason and conscience. The fact of the atonement has its origin or ground solely in the divine love. "For God so *loved* the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life." And, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." As then the divine love is the objective ground of the atonement in the being of God, so it must be the subjective principle also of a true construction of the doctrine of the atonement.

"God is love," says the apostle who had stood nearest to the Lord, and penetrated most profoundly into the mystery of His being. And this definition presupposes another, namely, that given by the Lord Himself: "God is a Spirit." Love is an exercise of a spiritual or personal being. Impersonal things may show evidence of blind attraction or attachment, but they cannot be properly said to love. For love in its essential nature is free personal communion, or a free flowing together of personal beings. In the exercise of love one person imparts to another, not merely his property or possessions, but himself, and in turn receives the person and fortune of the other into the closest fellowship with his own being; so that in love there is an identification, not merely of external interests, but of the contents of personality itself. In the essence of love, then, there must be distinguished these two elements or movements: *communication* and *participation*, or giving and receiving, in

were current in ancient heathenism and in pre-Christian Judaism, or even when these conceptions are allowed to exercise a determinative influence upon the form of that doctrine. If it may be held that these conceptions are natural anticipations or prophecies of the Christian reality, it must not be forgotten that these natural prophecies are greatly blurred by the distorting sense of sin and guilt, and that they must hence be very unsafe data for the determination of the nature of that Christian reality.

which the object given and the object received is a *self* or person. And these elements mutually condition each other ; so that there can be no communication of the contents of one self to another without a simultaneous participation on the part of the former in the contents of the latter ; that is to say, one person can only give himself, his thoughts, his feelings, his volitions to another on condition that he receives the thoughts, feelings and volitions of the other into himself. And the idea of love can only be fully realized where this giving and receiving is mutual between two persons. The second self must be communicative and participative in relation to the first, as well as the first in relation to the second. If either of two selves refuse to surrender itself to the other, or to receive the other into itself, the realization of love cannot be brought to pass. In such case a proper respect for one's own self, as well as a proper respect for the other's self, would prevent either of two persons from forcing himself upon the other. I cannot, if I respect myself, force myself upon the person of another by whom I am not wanted ; for to do so would be to offer an indignity to the worth of my own personality. Neither can I, if I respect the person of another, force him to surrender himself to me ; for that would be a violation of his rights as a person and an indignity to his personal worth. Where these limitations and conditions are disregarded, as happens not seldom in the sexual sphere, when unions are determined by mere considerations of property or rank, or by carnal feelings and passions, there results a mere caricature of love.

This, of course, is a description of human love. But human love must be regarded as a copy of the divine love ; for, since man is the image of God, the essential activities of the mind of man must be reflections of the activities of the mind of God. Hence a true description of human love must be applicable also to the love of God. Only in one respect must the divine love be regarded as differing from the human, namely in respect of the *degree in which it is realized*. Human love must ever be imperfect, inasmuch as the mutual self-communication in which

it consists must ever be limited and incomplete. A created personality cannot completely give itself to another, because it does not completely possess itself. There is in the constitution of our personality a region of being over which we have no control, for it never comes into our consciousness, and is, therefore, not subject to the determination of our will. We have not made ourselves, and therefore we do not wholly know ourselves, and cannot wholly determine ourselves. But with the being of God it is otherwise. There is in His nature no such dark background or root of being as that which we discover in ourselves, and which limits both our self-knowledge and our self-determination. The being of God must be viewed as perfectly transparent to His consciousness and perfectly subject to the determination of His will. If there were any part of His being that God does not understand, or if His being were not perfectly subject to His will, then God would neither be omniscient nor omnipotent. The attribute of omnipotence implies that God has complete power, not only over all existence outside of Himself, but also over His own existence. God's being is perfectly in His own possession. And having Himself perfectly or completely in His own possession, God is able completely to give Himself up to another.

Such a process of absolute self-communication must have place in the inner Trinitarian life of God Himself. The three distinct subjects or *selves* in the Godhead are not three separate beings, but on the contrary the being of one is the being of each of the others. The Father thus communicates His entire being to the Son and Spirit, and again receives the entire being of each into Himself. And this intercommunication of being in the Godhead, which the Greek theologians called *ἐκχώρησις*, is not a blind or physical process, so that there would be an unconscious circulation of being or life in God, somewhat resembling the circulation of the blood in the human body; but on the contrary it is a process that is perfectly intelligent and free. It rests upon the power of perfect self-determination in God. And upon this power of perfect self-determination rests

also the possibility of God's perfect self-impartment to the creation, that is, the possibility of the *incarnation*. God, because He has full control or power over His own being, is able to impart to the personal creature whom His will has called into existence, not merely something that belongs to Himself, some property or quality, but *Himself*; that is to say, He is able to enter perfectly into the life of man and to experience in His own person all the conditions of human existence, and then in turn to make man experience the condition of His own blessed existence. And in this union of God with man there is no violence done to the nature of either, for it is not a conjunction of heterogeneous elements between which there is no natural affinity, but the union of two forms of existence which are related as type and anti-type, or as pattern and copy, and which are therefore constitutionally akin to each other.

But as the *possibility* of such total self-impartment on the part of God is involved in His absolute self-possession, so the *necessity* of it also is involved in His life of absolute love. God as love cannot but desire to communicate Himself, not only within Himself, but also to a realm of being other than Himself. And it is in fulfillment of this desire that He calls into existence a world of personal beings. Thus while the creation is not necessary in order to complete the being of God, it is nevertheless not arbitrary, but rests upon an inner necessity of His nature. And the world of personal creatures thus brought into being, each one of whom is the actualization of a distinct thought of God begotten of His eternal love, is from the first designed to receive from God not merely existence and other gifts, but to receive God Himself, and to be made participant of the divine nature. The eternal love of God could not be satisfied without manifesting itself in this absolutely complete form. The incarnation of God must thus be supposed to form an original thought in the eternal divine world-plan. It is not an afterthought or device, adopted because something else had occurred, or was foreseen to occur, but it is original and central in the counsels of eternal love. And that it is the

person of the Logos that is the subject of the incarnation is not accidental, but has its ground in the fact that He is the mediator of all God's outward activity, "through whom all things were made," and "in whom all things consist." The Logos is that self of the Godhead in whom, as in one utterance or word, God has comprehended and expressed the whole plenitude of His being and of His eternal creative ideas, and through whom these latter have been spoken forth and embodied in the multitudinous forms of existence which constitute the objective world, and of which His own person is the all-embracing, all-uniting bond. It was fitting, then, that through the person of the Logos, through whom God imparted to the world its being, He should also impart to it His own self, and gather together under Him, as under their living head, all intelligent spirits, nay all things in heaven and earth, in one glorious kingdom of eternal love and blessedness.

But while thus the manifestation of God's eternal love in Christ is independent of sin, yet the occurrence of sin has profoundly modified the form of this manifestation. It is a condition of the perfect realization of love that it be freely reciprocated. The person that loves must be loved in return; that is, the offer of self on the part of one must be met by a corresponding offer on the part of another. Where this is not the case, the impulse to love on the part of one may indeed not cease, but then it will take a new form and will be attended no longer by peaceful or happy results. In the human sphere unreciprocated love will take the form of *jealousy*, which is the grief and indignation that love feels over its own rejection. It cannot abandon the object; it can only feel grieved because that object is unwilling or unworthy to accept the offer which it makes of itself. This feeling of grief or jealousy may among men degenerate into hatred, or a desire of vengeance, that is ready to inflict harm upon the beloved object. But then it is devilish, not God-like; and from such perversion of a noble human impulse surely no inference can be drawn as to the

character and disposition of God.* The feeling of jealousy, or of indignation in consequence of rejected love, must, however, have something analogous in the mind of God. God cannot remain in a state of cold indifference when the offer of Himself, which is the best and greatest gift which He could bestow, is despised and rejected. God must respect Himself. His love must be true to its own idea. It cannot be thrown away in disregard of its dignity and worth. This is the *holiness* of God. God is holy because He respects Himself, and maintains the dignity of His personality; or because in loving He remains true to His own idea of Himself. He knows His own worth, and cannot disregard it. Hence God cannot be indifferent to the rejection and contempt of His love on the part of the creature. But such rejection and contempt there is in all sin. Sin is self-separation from God. It involves a rejection of God, and a determination to be as God, not in communion with Him, which is the end of creaturely existence, but in isolation from Him, according to the suggestion of the ancient serpent in Paradise. To such behavior on the part of the creature God cannot be indifferent. He cannot continue to let His love go out in blessing to a being that has renounced Him, and put itself into an attitude of opposition towards Him, even if the nature of such being would permit this; for this would be a violation of His own self-respect. But neither can He renounce His love, and be satisfied with the separation of the creature; for that would be a negation of His own nature. God, in order to be true to His nature, must continue to love; but under the changed conditions which sin produces, His love must take a new form, a form resembling jealousy in the human sphere, and that is His *wrath*. The wrath of God, like His holiness, is thus a determination of His love. It is the inversion of His love, where that love is not reciprocated. If holiness be the self-respect of love, wrath is the indignation which must be

* Heathenism has drawn such inferences, and gotten as a result conceptions of gods that are malicious and cruel, and whose anger may be propitiated by the sight of blood and torture.

felt when that self-respect is wounded. The wrath of God is not a passion or rage, not a thirst for vengeance that can be appeased by blood and torture, but the calm and sorrowing grief, the pain of slighted love, which cannot but manifest itself in displeasure toward the sinner, and which displeasure must continue as long as sin continues, but cannot continue a moment longer. God must be displeased by the apostasy of a creature, and that displeasure can only be changed by a return to allegiance.

The exercise of the divine love in its own genuine form, on the intervention of sin, thus meets with a limitation in the ideality or holiness of its own nature. But it meets with another such limitation also in its necessary consideration of the nature and rights of the creature. Love must be *free*. It must not only be freely bestowed on the one side, but it must also be freely reciprocated on the other. One person cannot force himself upon another against the will of that other, for this would be a destruction of the very nature of love. True love must not only respect itself, but it must also respect the person, and with the person, the nature and freedom of its object. These conditions must be observed by the divine love towards the creature, as well as by that of a creature towards a fellow-creature. The creature, in order to be worthy of the divine love, must be an intelligent and free self or person. God could not love a mere *thing*, any more than a man can love a stone or plant. To speak of *loving* a lifeless or soulless thing is a mere abuse of language. A being to be loved must be a person, possessing intelligence and will, and therefore capable of rejecting as well as accepting the offer of love. This freedom God cannot over-ride. He cannot force Himself upon an unwilling creature; for if He did, its freedom would be overthrown, and it would cease to be a worthy object of His love.

But if a creature, in the exercise of its freedom, separate itself from God, and refuse the offer of His love, it cannot, as long as this opposition lasts, be in a state of well-being. Such

is the constitution of its nature, and such the law of its life that it can enjoy its own existence only in real communion with God. The will of God is the law of being and life for the creature, not merely confronting it with commandments from without, but being inwrought in its very constitution; and, therefore, whenever the will of the creature is in a state of rebellion against the will of God, then the creature is at war with itself, and inner discord and pain must be the inevitable consequence. The divine wisdom says, "He that sinneth against me, wrongeth his own soul." Any created being whatever can be in a state of well-being only so long as its action is in harmony with the law of its nature, which law is an expression of the will of its Maker. The plant can live and flourish only if it buries its roots in the soil and expands its branches and leaves towards the light. If the position were reversed, the law of its nature would be violated and it would die. And so man can be blessed in his existence only when his action is in harmony with the law of his nature, which law demands that he freely give himself up to God in loving obedience to His will. If he fails to do this, then he not only sins against God, but he wrongs his own soul, and the consequence must be pain and death. And from this consequence God cannot save the sinner so long as he continues in a state of hostility and opposition to Himself.

There are here two things which God cannot do: He cannot compel man to love and obey Him, nor can He make him blessed in spite of persistent opposition and disobedience; for to do either would be to do violence to the nature of man. God owes it to man to respect his nature, and not to reverse or annul the essential conditions of his existence and well-being. And in the observance of this obligation on the part of God consists His *justice*. God is just in that He does the creature no wrong, but respects and maintains its rights. But it would be a wrong to the nature of man, if God were either to annihilate his freedom and force him to a blind or unwilling obedience, like that which the slave yields to the will of the master,

or the stone to the law of gravitation; or if He were arbitrarily to annul the consequences of disobedience, and cause him, in a way that is contrary to the law of his being, to feel pleasure instead of pain. The difficulty of grasping this last thought is in some measure a proof of the impossibility of the thing. A happy devil is an impossibility even in thought. God owes it to the devil not to make him happy as long as he remains devil—that is, not to connect happiness with sin; and God would not be just if He did not observe this obligation. And so God owes it to man to leave him to suffer the pain which sin involves just as long as the sin endures; for to take away this pain, while sin continues, would only be possible on condition of such radical reconstruction of human nature as would involve the destruction of the very capacity for blessedness; as the administration of an opiate not merely suspends the sense of physical pain, but for the time being all sensation. God, therefore, leaves man to suffer the pain of sin, which consists in the miseries that afflict soul and body, or in spiritual and physical death; and in this there is the manifestation of God's justice; which, according to its very nature, cannot be satisfied by any legal fiction or device, such as is involved in the old doctrine of substitutionary punishment, but only by the conversion of the sinner and the re-instatement of him in his right relation to God.

But while the justice of God demands that the sinner should be left to suffer the pain of sin, yet His love does not permit that He should leave him to suffer it alone. This would require that He should renounce His love and abandon the sinner; which is a thing that must be forever impossible. God, therefore, must suffer also; and He must suffer with the sinner. We have seen that love has two sides, or that two essential acts are united in it, namely, *communication* and *participation*. In the action of love one person not only communicates himself, with his property, condition and fortune, to another, but also receives the person, property, condition and fortune of the other into communion with himself. In fact, the former act presupposes

the latter, as well as the latter the former. One must have really entered into the life and fortune of another, must have participated in his thoughts, his feelings and his desires, and must have felt his wants, his sorrows and miseries, in order that he may really impart himself to that other for his benefit; and, conversely, such participation is possible only on condition of this same self-impartment. We see thus how a fellowship of suffering, as well as a fellowship of joy, must be involved in the very nature of love. Wherever there is love, it causes not only rejoicing with them that do rejoice, but also weeping with them that weep. Thus the mother weeps with her child. Thus friend suffers and weeps with friend. So a father suffers even with a disobedient and rebellious son. The sin, the disgrace and the pain of the son lie heavy on the father's heart, and wring it with agony and grief. David's lamentation for Absalom is an illustration of this fellowship of suffering which is in love. "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" That is an expression of wounded love which really feels all the pain and all the wretchedness of the beloved object. And so God must feel the pain of the creature whom His love has called into being—the Father of spirits must suffer with His children. He cannot arbitrarily, and without the abandonment of sin on the part of the creature, cancel the consequences of sin, for that is rendered impossible both by His own self-respect and by His respect for the dignity and rights of the creature; but He can help to bear these consequences—nay, He can take them up into His own life and bear them with and for the sinner.

The sin of man does not arrest the movement towards complete self-communication, which forms a factor of the divine love. This movement goes on until God has wholly given Himself to humanity in the person of the incarnate Logos, in order that through Him as its spiritual Head the whole race of mankind may be made participant of the divine nature. But it goes on now, after the occurrence of sin, only in the form in

which it could go on in these circumstances, namely, in the form of *humiliation* and *suffering*. God in the person of His Son Jesus Christ not only gives Himself to the world in order to its *divinization*, but He also suffers with it its pain and misery. And He can do the one only because He does the other. This fellow-suffering or sympathy with the world's misery is the necessary condition of the perfect actualization of the divine love. And this divine sympathy or *compassion* with a fallen and suffering race goes on until it becomes the *passion* of the Son of God on the cross, through which that race is redeemed. In this it transcends the measure of all merely human love. For, as man is prevented by his want of perfect self-possession, or by the imperfect realization of his personality, from imparting himself completely to another, so he is prevented also from participating completely in the state and condition of another; and the fellowship of suffering, however real and vivid it may be, can therefore not go beyond the bounds of subjective sympathy; except where it is conditioned by the solidarity of physical life, and there it becomes mere physical pain. But in God there is no such limitation. He is able not merely to *sympathize* with another, or ideally to reproduce another's pain in His own mind; but He is able so to identify Himself with another as actually to assume that other's pain and suffer it Himself. This perfect consummation of God's love we behold in the tragedy of the cross. There God has so perfectly identified Himself with humanity, though not with its sin,* as to become partaker of its sorrow and suffering, its pain

* In the conception of the *mystical union* subsisting between Christ and men, as apprehended by some of the scholastic theologians of the Middle Age, such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Thomas Aquinas, there is involved also the idea of an identification in human *sin*, or at least in *guilt*. The later notion of an arbitrary *imputation* of guilt is thus avoided, but, as we believe, at too great a cost. Bernard takes literally St. Paul's statement that "if one died for all, then all died," and declares that "he who made satisfaction for sin was not a different person from him who had sinned, because the head and the body are one Christ." Thus Christ, in consequence of His oneness with humanity, becomes partaker of human guilt not

and death. And the fruit of this identification of God with us is that we also may become so identified with God, through faith and love, as to be made partakers of the divine nature, that is, the divine wisdom, and righteousness, and blessedness, and glory.

The suffering of Christ, thus being occasioned by the world's sin, was in its nature *vicarious*, though not for that reason *penal*. It was not a legal satisfaction of divine justice by furnishing an equivalent in suffering for the punishment of the world's guilt. This entire conception becomes meaningless in view of the above definition of the divine justice. It is not the satisfaction of the divine justice, accomplished by a substitute in man's stead, that we behold in the cross of Christ, but rather the self-satisfaction of the divine love in and for humanity. There is in this world much vicarious suffering. Everywhere we behold the innocent suffering for the guilty. Parents suffer for their children, and children for their parents; rulers for their people, and the people for their rulers. The fact of such communion of suffering among men is no proof of a com-

only *putatively*, but *really*. The view of these theologians was probably influenced both by their *realistic* conception of the idea of humanity, and by their notion of the incarnation as primarily an ontological rather than a moral process. We escape their conclusion partly by modifying their conception of humanity, which we cannot allow to be a reality in such sense that the assumption of it by the Logos was at once such an identification of Him with every human personality as to make Him partaker of its sin and guilt; but especially by viewing the incarnation as primarily a *moral process*, starting in the divine love and determined at every point by the divine will. We do not hold that a participation on the part of the incarnate God in the guilt and sin of humanity (for *guilt* and *sin* are inseparable) was in itself an impossibility, for we believe in Christ's freedom of choice; but we hold that it was not a necessary consequence of the incarnation. Christ *might* have assumed the guilt of humanity by assuming, that is, by *willing* its sin. This was a possibility of His formal freedom; but it was a possibility that was never realized. Christ never willed sin; and without His will sin could not be connected with Him, or thrust upon Him. He assumed only what it was His *will* to assume, namely, the pain and woe of humanity, without its sin and guilt.

munion of guilt, and certainly no proof of an arbitrary imputation of guilt by the righteous Ruler of the universe. When an innocent child suffers for the sins of a parent, or an innocent parent for the sins of a child, such suffering is not penal and discharges no moral debt. The drunken father is not made any less guilty before God and men by the fact that his wife and children participate in the shame and poverty caused by his sinful indulgence of appetite. So far are we from regarding such vicarious suffering as penal, and as discharging foreign guilt, that we tolerate the thought of it only because we regard it as *temporary* and *disciplinary*. The fact of vicarious suffering, as it prevails in this world, is a dark mystery, that receives its illumination only from the light of the world to come. Far from being an ultimate arrangement for resolving the world's wrong, it is itself an essential wrong, but one which God can tolerate here, because there comes a hereafter, when all the wrongs of time may be righted; and also because in a sinful world it serves a disciplinary purpose in the development of moral character.

This conception of the nature of vicarious suffering is in Scripture recognized also in relation to the suffering of Christ. For the Apostle Peter proposes as an example to Christian believers, which they are exhorted to follow, the suffering of Christ, "who when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, threatened not; but *committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously*," thus recognizing the essential wrongfulness of His suffering, but looking to God for His vindication and reward. And St. Paul exhorts believers to cultivate the same mind that was in Christ, who "being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name*;" thus representing the suffering of Christ as an act of self-humiliation and obedience under the endurance of wrong, which God has rewarded by the bestowment upon Him of the highest honors. If the suffering of Christ had been endured as a legal or penal satis-

faction for the guilt of the world, how then could it be proposed to Christians as an example for their imitation, or how could they be exhorted to have the same mind that was in Christ? That Christ suffered for us, and that He died for us, and for our sins, as the New Testament so plainly states, is therefore no proof that God put upon Him our sins and punished Him in our stead. That thought is not in the Bible, nor is it necessarily involved in the idea of vicarious suffering. In order that Christ might suffer with us and in our behalf the consequences of our sins, it was not necessary that our sins should be imputed to Him, nor that He should assume our guilt—a thing which He could only have done by entering into the evil will from which guilt comes; but it was necessary only that in the spirit of eternal love He should assume our nature and perfectly identify Himself with our condition. A father does not assume the guilt of a wicked son, when he weeps hot tears of sorrow over that son's shame and misery. David was free from the guilt of his son Absalom, when he so bitterly lamented his tragic fate. And so Christ, when He sweated drops of blood in Gethsemane, and when He felt forsaken of God on the cross, knew that He was perfectly free from guilt. He had neither assumed any guilt, nor had a foreign guilt been imputed to Him—which is an impossibility even in thought. But He realized in His own soul, as it is only possible for perfect love to realize, the terrible weight of the world's guilt (not as His own, however), and felt in His own heart the pain and anguish which pressed upon the heart of sinful and lost humanity. We need to assume nothing more than this in order to explain St. Paul's very strong utterances, that "*Christ was made sin for us*, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him;" and that "*He has redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.*" He was made sin for us, not in the sense of having had imputed to Him the guilt of our sins, and then having made satisfaction by bearing in body and soul the legal penalty thereof, even down to the *mors eterna*, or torments of hell; but he was made sin for us, and a curse, in the sense

of having, in the actualization of His infinite love, so identified Himself with our actual condition as sinful beings that He suffered with us the existing consequences of our sins, to the end that we through Him may now become so identified with God as to become partakers of the righteousness which is in Him. If this should appear to some to be a trivial distinction, or a distinction without a difference, we have only to say that it does not appear so to us. We believe that it is a distinction that is fraught with important consequences in the entire view of this subject. There are places on the earth's surface where the water that springs out of the ground only a few feet apart, flows into different oceans. And so there are principles of thought which may seem very much alike, and yet lead to very different results.

The suffering of Christ, thus, as we have seen, growing out of the essence and movement of divine love, was in its nature not a matter of *necessity*, but of *freedom*. It was not a fatality, which He could not have escaped, but a thing which He voluntarily assumed. That is to say, there was no physical or metaphysical necessity, outside of His will, that compelled Him either to become man, or having become man, to suffer. The necessity under which He acted was entirely a moral necessity, lying wholly in His will of love, and therefore identical with perfect volitional freedom. This conception He expresses Himself, when He says: "Therefore does the Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." But as a matter of freedom, and not of constraint, the suffering of Christ was a *moral transaction*, and served a moral purpose in the perfecting of His own life. We have already observed that in this world suffering may serve a disciplinary purpose in the development of moral character. And such significance must be recognized also in the suffering of Christ. This view is plainly expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "It became Him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things,

in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through suffering." And again: "Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered, and having been made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation."

The necessity of a process of moral development in the case of Christ grew out of His real humanity. The person of Christ is perfectly human as well as perfectly divine; and yet there are not two persons, but one. Such perfect union of deity and humanity in one person was possible because of the power of perfect self-determination on the part of deity, and because of the original relationship of affinity between the divine and human natures. The early Church was guided by marvelous insight into the original relation between deity and humanity, when it decided that Christ exists in two natures without confusion, without change, without division, and without separation; for the divine and human natures are not entities that are totally foreign to each other, but homogeneous; and their constitution, therefore, is such that neither of them need suffer any confusion or change in order that they may be brought together indivisibly and inseparable in the unity of a single person.* But being truly and perfectly human, the person of Christ was subject to the laws of moral development which condition the unfolding of human life universally. Now

* In order to understand fully the affinity between the divine and human natures, and the capacity of the human for the divine, it is necessary to contemplate the human nature not merely in its present state of imperfection and sin, but in its future state of perfection and glory, as we can now know it only in the person of Christ after His resurrection, but as we shall hereafter know it in the person of every Christian. The exaltation of human nature as we behold it in the risen and glorified Christ is not a violation of the law of this nature, but is a fact involved in its original conception and constitution. And so it was no violation of the law of the divine nature that in the person of the Logos the deity should determine itself to the assumption of a human form of existence and manifestation, temporarily in humiliation, afterwards in glory; for this also must be supposed to have been in accordance with an original tendency in the divine being and life.

one of the most fundamental of these laws is that of liberty of choice in relation to moral good and evil. The will of Christ as human must, therefore, have been free to choose between these opposites; and this human will could have had no separate divine will standing over against it and making such free choice impossible. The decision of the Church in favor of *dióthelitism* has a sound sense only when understood to mean that there are in Christ, not two volitional faculties (*theleseis*), but two kinds or classes of volitions (*thelemata*) corresponding to the two natures. Existing in human form, then, with power of alternative choice between good and evil, it was necessary for Christ to pass through a process of moral and religious development such as is essential to human nature. And such moral development or growth is affirmed of Him in the New Testament. "He advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."

And now in relation to this moral development His sufferings served a *probationary* and *disciplinary* purpose. They had for Him the force of temptation. This thought is distinctly stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2: 18), where it is affirmed that "having been Himself tempted in that wherein He suffered, He is able to succour them that are tempted." His suffering was the consequence of His fidelity to Himself and His mission, in opposition to a sinful world. But this fidelity was not compulsory, but free; and in His sufferings there was an appeal to His will to surrender His fidelity in the exercise of His freedom. Thus all through life the alternative presented itself to Him that He might either be true to the divine idea of His life and mission, and suffer for it at the hands of the world; or that He might surrender Himself to the current worldly ideals of the Messianic kingdom, and thus enjoy the favor of the world and avoid suffering. This was the alternative presented by the devil, probably through some human agency, in the temptation of the wilderness. And to the force of this temptation Jesus was not insensible. He was not ignorant of what was meant by the devil's offer of the kingdoms of the world

and of their glory; nor was He ignorant of what would be involved for Him in the rejection of that offer. But faithful to the divine idea of His mission as king of truth and righteousness, and to the divine idea of the kingdom of God to be established by Him in righteousness, He rejected the brilliant offers of Satan, and in consequence entered upon the path of suffering which at last culminated on the cross. The cross was the consequence of a moral collision of Jesus with His age. This is undoubtedly the light in which it is presented in the Gospels. The Jews crucified Christ because He claimed to be the Messiah, but would not be a Messiah in accordance with their expectations and ideals. But when a man suffers for his conduct, there is in that suffering a motive or temptation to abandon that conduct; and if he remains firm and dies for his conduct, he gains a victory over that temptation, even while he gives up his life. And so Christ in the suffering of the cross, which was His last trial, maintained His fidelity to the utmost, and was thus Himself morally made perfect, while at the same time He achieved a final victory over the powers of evil in the world. "Having put off from Himself the principalities and the powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in the *cross*" (Col. 2: 15). And this victory is not for Himself only, but for mankind, although the benefit of it can only be made to accrue to the individual by means of a personal appropriation through moral action; for "He became the author of eternal salvation to *all them that obey Him*."

But while thus in relation to its origin in the love of God the suffering of Christ was, not an infliction of penalty, but an expression of sympathy with fallen and suffering man; and while in relation to Himself it was a moral trial, and in relation to the powers of evil a moral victory; it had also a relation to God as end, and in that relation it was a *sacrifice*. It had the character of a sacrifice, because it was both the consequence and the crowning perfection of His life of obedience to the Father, and because obedience is the soul of all true sacrifice. When it is said, therefore, that "He gave Himself an

offering and sacrifice unto God for an odor of a sweet smell," that does not mean that He endured a certain amount of pain and torture, with which God was pleased as such; but it means that He gave His life in consequence and in confirmation of His love and obedience to God, and that this was the ground of God's good pleasure in Him. An odor of a sweet smell to God can never be anything else than a life of loving obedience. The other idea, that God can be pleased by the mere contemplation of blood and torture, is not in the Bible. That idea no doubt existed in the religion of the Aztecs, and in that of the Druids of Gaul, but it never had any place in the religion of revelation.* In the Old Testament the notion of sacrifice was differently apprehended at different times and by different persons. Sometimes it signified merely a gift or present, which in the smoke and savor arising from the altar, was believed to ascend up to heaven, and to affect the mind of the deity in the same way that a gift affects the mind of man. This, as it is the crudest, was doubtless the most primitive conception of the idea of sacrifice. Sometimes, again, the notion of sacrifice was regarded as denoting a symbolical expression of love and devotion to God, or a symbolical act of self-consecration to the will of God. This was the prevailing conception in the minds of those prophets who declaim against the multiplication of sacrificial offerings without a corresponding degree of piety. And, finally, the notion of sacrifice was apprehended in a mys-

* For a brief account of the horrible cruelties of the Aztecs, who annually slaughtered twenty thousand human victims in the temples of Huitzilapochtli in Mexico, see *Library of Universal Knowledge*, Vol. ix. p. 773. Of the Druids Caesar relates that "pro vita hominis nisi hominis vita redatur, non posse aliter deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrabantur: publiceque ejusdem generis habent instituta sacrificia. Alii immani magnitudine simulacra habent, quorum contexta viminibus membra vivis hominibus complent, quibus succensis, circumventi flamma exanimantur homines. Supplicia eorum, qui in furto aut in latrocinio aut aliqua noxa sint comprehensi, gratiora diis immortalibus esse arbitrabantur: sed, quum ejus generis copia deficit, etiam ad innocentium supplicia descendunt." *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 16. No such ideas or practices are met with anywhere in the Old Testament.

tical sense, the soul of the sacrificial victim being supposed in some mysterious way to intervene between God and men as a covering of sin. This is the view expressed in the Levitical law.

It is especially in the second of these significations that the suffering of Christ, or rather the surrender of His life in death, is spoken of in the New Testament as a *sacrifice*. This is particularly the case in the epistle to the Hebrews (chap. 10), where the doing of the will of God is represented as the essence in which His sacrifice consisted. "He was manifested once at the end of the ages," says the writer, "to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." This sacrifice was the reality of which the offerings of the law furnished not even a distinct image, but merely a vague and imperfect shadow (Heb. 10: 1). With those offerings God could not really be pleased, nor could the blood of beasts, which were offered according to the law, take away sin. But when God is represented (Ps. 40) as saying that He has no pleasure in sacrifices, or burnt-offerings, or sin-offerings, then the suffering servant of the Psalm, who, according to the writer of Hebrews, stands for the approaching Messiah, is made to exclaim, "Lo, I come, in the roll of the book it is written of me, *to do thy will, O God.*" And that, namely, the doing of the will of God is the true sacrifice, the only sacrifice wherewith God is pleased, and whereby we are sanctified. And the suffering of Christ on the cross is the consequence and consummation of this doing of the will of God—the supreme act in which His life of obedience and self-consecration came to its culmination.

In this doing of the will of God, or in this obedience unto death, which formed the essence or soul of the sacrifice of Christ, consisted also the *satisfaction* which He rendered to the divine law and justice. Christ satisfied the law of God, not by bearing the penalty for its violation on the part of others, but in the only way in which law can ever be satisfied, that is, by rendering obedience to the will of the law-giver. No law is ever satisfied by suffering the penalty resulting from its violation.

If a planet were to break away from its orbit and wander lawlessly through space, all life on it would cease and it would perish as a planet; but there would be in such perdition no satisfaction of the law of gravitation and of planetary motion. That law is only satisfied by obedience on the part of the heavenly bodies. And so the man who has served out a sentence in the penitentiary is not supposed to have satisfied the law; for, after being released, he does not in the moral judgment of society occupy the place which he would have occupied if he had never been a criminal. That place he can only regain by repentance and reformation, and by putting himself into right relation to the law through obedience. And so Christ satisfied the law of God, not by suffering the punishment which was due for its violation on the part of others, but by His doing of the will of God, or by His *active* obedience to the will of God through life, of which His suffering, or His *passive* obedience on the cross, was but the crowning consummation.*

But this satisfaction of the divine law on the part of Christ, serves, in virtue of His central position in humanity as its spiritual head, and in virtue of His essential relation to all men, to bring them also into the same relation of obedience to the law of God; not indeed by any magical operation, nor by means of an unconscious process of nature, but by moral action and influence. For by keeping the law, and being Himself made perfect through sufferings, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all those who *obey* Him. Christ became not a

* This distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ, which was first made in the theology of the Reformation, and the apprehension of the passive as the completion and result of the active obedience, if logically carried out, leads back to the Patristic conception of the life of Christ as being *atoning* or *saving* in every moment and stage of it. This conception is involved in the famous passage of Irenæus, in which he speaks of Christ as having passed through every age, from infancy onward, to the end that He might sanctify and save men of all ages, saying that "having recapitulated in Himself the entire life of man, He also recapitulated his death." This conception is involved also in the ancient Litany, in which we still pray for deliverance, not merely by the suffering and death of Christ, but also by His incarnation and nativity, by His circumcision, and by His baptism, fasting and temptation.

substitute for men, bearing the penalty of their sins apart from them, so that they may now escape punishment on the ground of this outward legal transaction; but in the action of His love, and in the realization of it, He so identified Himself with humanity as to become partaker of all the pain and misery under which this was laboring in consequence of sin; and now in turn, having been Himself made perfect through His vicarious suffering, He is able so to draw men unto Himself, and so to identify them with Himself, through the operation of the Spirit on His side, and through the exercise of faith and love on their side, as to make them partakers of His life and righteousness,* so that they may be no longer objects of the Father's wrath, but of His good pleasure. As the Father's good pleasure rests forever upon His only-begotten Son, so it rests upon those also who are in Him, and who, through the exercise of faith and love, have become so identified with Him as to be essentially, at least, of one life and character with Him. In this view Christ is the *propitiation* for human sin. St. John says, "He is the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the whole world." The word *ἱλασμός* here is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *kopher*, which was used to denote the atoning or propitiatory element in the sin-offering; and this propitiatory element, according to the latest conception of sacrifice, was believed to be the soul of the animal

* To become partaker of another's righteousness is not to have that righteousness set to one's account in an outward legal way; nor is it to have that righteousness imparted to one in a physical or metaphysical way, as a natural condition (a disease, for example) may be communicated from one subject to another; but to become partaker of another's righteousness is to appropriate that righteousness by a *moral process*, that is, a process of volition by which another's character is reproduced in one's own person. This is the only way in which a moral quality, such as righteousness, can be communicated from one person to another. It is in this sense that St. Paul says (Phil. 3: 9) that he desires to be found in Christ, not having as his righteousness that which is of the law, resulting from the anxious observance of outward commandments, as in the case of the Pharisees, but that which is through faith in Christ, that is, the righteousness which results as a consequence of the reproduction in his own person, through faith and love, of the moral character of Christ.

offered, in some mysterious way coming to stand as a *covering of sin* between men and God, in view of which God might be favorably disposed towards sinners.* Now Christ is the real Mediator between God and men, the righteous advocate, who secures God's favor and pardon, not by paying a legal equivalent for sin, but by so identifying men with Himself, through the working of the Spirit on the one hand, and the exercise of faith on the other, as to impart to them the principle and power of actual righteousness, and thus bringing them, at first as to the central tendency of their life, and then, more and more, into right relation to the divine law. It is because there is in Christ a dynamic principle of righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) capable of justifying (*δικαιοῦν*), or making righteous, the whole world, that God is able to be gracious to the sinner, and to overlook or pardon his sins. The pardon is not purchased and paid for, but is freely granted in view of the promise and potency of an actual *righting* of life which are involved in the sinner's union with Christ by faith. This is the teaching also of St. Paul on the subject of propitiation as well as of justification by faith, for he says that sinners "are justified freely (*δωρεάν*) by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth a propitiation (*ἱλαστήριον*) through faith in His blood." †

* This conception is expressed in the classical passage concerning the nature of atoning sacrifice, Lev. 17: 11. We read here, "The life (literally, *soul*) of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement (*ἑκκαπερ, to cover*) for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement (*ἑκκαπερ, covers*) by reason of the life (*soul*)."

† Rom. 3: 24, 25. Commentators differ in regard to the word to be supplied with the adjective *ἱλαστήριον*, some supposing it to be *θύμα, sacrifice*, others *ἐπίθεμα, mercy-seat*. If it must be supposed that either conception was distinctly in the mind of the Apostle, then we would prefer *θύμα*. We venture to suggest, however, that the adjective may be construed as masculine, and referred as predicate to the preceding pronoun *ὃν*, in which case the rendering would be: "whom God set forth as *propitiatory*," that is, in the character or quality of making propitiation, by means of His blood (His life or soul) which avails for justification (for the *righting* of themselves) of those who are one with Him by faith.

There is in Christ a spiritual life possessing an ethically quickening and vitalizing quality in relation to the whole of mankind, which is designed, and which is in its nature sufficient, to break the law of sin for every human being, and to regenerate and sanctify all men. Hence He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world—not merely for the sins of the whole number of actual believers, nor for the sins of an elect number who are predestined to be saved, but for the sins of the whole world. And hence the whole world is *redeemed* in Him. The term *redemption* and the related term *ransom* are figurative expressions denoting that by the appearance and work of Christ in humanity something has occurred for the advantage of men, which, in its moral effects, is analogous to what is accomplished by the payment of a price for the liberation of a slave or of a prisoner taken in war. The figure, of course, is not intended to be taken literally; for if it is taken literally, and if it is supposed to be necessary to explain not only the nature of the ransom, but also the object to whom it was paid, then we get either the monstrous conception that this object was the devil, or the impossible conception that it was God.* As far as the latter notion is concerned, directly the reverse is taught in the New Testament, namely, that we have been purchased and redeemed, not *from* God, but *for* God or *unto* God. In Rev. 5: 9 it is said of Christ that He purchased *unto* God with His blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation. That from which sinners are redeemed or freed, according to Scripture, is the power and curse of sin itself. Compare Gal.

* We quote the following sentences from Coleridge on the point here under consideration: "Forgiveness of sin, the abolition of guilt, through the redemptive power of Christ's love and of His perfect obedience, is expressed, on account of the resemblance of consequence in both cases, by the payment of a debt for another, which debt the payer had not himself incurred. Now the impropriation of this metaphor (*i. e.*, the taking it literally) by transferring the sameness from the consequents to the antecedents, or inferring the identity of the causes from a resemblance in the effects, this view or scheme of redemption I believe to be altogether unscriptural."—*Aids to Reflection*. We have only to add that we are decidedly of the same opinion.

1: 4 and 3: 13. There is a law of sin pervading the organism of humanity as a whole, as well as the individual soul, which, like some cacoplastic growth in the human body, perverts all the forces of spiritual life, and makes impossible the normal exercise of any spiritual or moral functions. Now, by the self-identification of God with humanity in the life and death of Christ, this law of sin has been centrally and radically broken; and an ethically and spiritually quickening principle has been introduced into the life of humanity, which, in its scope and power, comprehends every human being; that is to say, in the divine intention and in real possibility every human being has been redeemed in Christ. The life and death of Christ have not only produced a favorable change in the moral possibilities of humanity, and of every human soul, but they have produced a like favorable change also in the relation of humanity to God. And this change in the moral condition of humanity, and in its relation to God, is its redemption.

And this redemption, viewed in its subjective completion, or in its actual appropriation by the individual, is our *reconciliation* or *atonement*.* "Through Christ we have now received the *reconciliation*" (*καταλλάξῃ*, old version *atonement*, Rom. 5: 11). *Καταλλάξῃ*, from *καταλλάσσω*, means a change, especially a change of mind or feeling, and so a change from enmity to friendship, that is, *reconciliation*. The subject of this change must be viewed not exclusively as man, nor exclusively as God, but as comprehending both, though each in a somewhat different

* The word *atonement* is doubtless composed of *at* and *one* with the suffix syllable *ment*—like *adunare* from *ad* and *unus* in Latin—and was used originally in the sense of *making one* or *reconciling* parties at variance. Shakespeare uses both the verb *atone* and the noun *atonement* in this sense. And in this sense also the word is used in the common version of the New Testament, while in the Old Testament it is used rather to denote the propitiatory act by which the divine wrath was believed to be turned away and the divine favor secured. It will hence appear how inappropriate it is, at least from the New Testament standpoint, to speak of a *vicarious atonement*. There is reason to speak of the suffering and sacrifice of Christ as *vicarious*; but the *atonement* can not be *vicarious* or *representative*, for *reconciliation* is a condition that can only result from a change of mind of the parties directly concerned.

sense. We have seen that God cannot but be displeased with the sinner, and that He must, in justice to the sinner's nature, leave him to suffer the consequences of sin so long as the sin endures. But now, through the mediation of Christ, by which the sin is conquered in the sinner, this divine displeasure is transformed into favor, and the sinner is *pardoned*. The work of redemption accomplished by Christ in the sinner is answered by the act of forgiveness on the part of God. Hence redemption and forgiveness of sin are correlative conceptions. "In Christ," says St. Paul, "we have our redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of God's grace" (Eph. 1: 7). The same language occurs in Col. 1: 14. Only this transformation of the divine displeasure into favor, involving the forgiveness of sin, must not be regarded as a *temporal* transaction in the mind of God, beginning either at the time when Christ appeared on earth, or at the time when the sinner is converted. God's thinking and acting are not limited by time; and Christ's mediatorial work has an eternal reach and significance, for He is the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Thus, in the divine idea and purpose humanity is not only redeemed, but reconciled. In Christ the redemption and reconciliation of the world are an objective fact, which needs only to be subjectively apprehended and appropriated by the individual.

But, secondly, it is the sinner that is reconciled to God; and it is on this side of the process that the chief stress is laid in the New Testament. The reconciliation does not imply a change from enmity to friendship in the mind of God, for God never was our enemy; but it does imply such a change in the mind of man; and in this sense reconciliation is a temporal occurrence coinciding in point of time with the regeneration and conversion of the sinner. The carnal mind, we are told, that is, the state of mind determined by the flesh, is enmity towards God; and this enmity must be broken and transformed into love in order to our salvation. And this transformation is not a thing that can be brought to pass vicariously or by proxy,

but something that must take place in the soul of every sinner himself. Hence the Apostle says that, "while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son;" and again, that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." The implication of these passages is that, while the death of Christ is the procuring cause of reconciliation, as evidencing the divine mercy and forgiveness, yet the reconciliation itself is an occurrence that must take place in the minds of sinners. And it is the office, therefore, of ministers of the Gospel, as ambassadors in behalf of Christ, to beseech men that they be reconciled to God. God is reconciled unto us. Of this fact the death of Christ is both the demonstration and pledge. And on the basis of this fact men are, through the ministry of the Gospel, to be converted and reconciled unto God.*

And this office of the Christian ministry, as we believe, is not rightly discharged when God is misrepresented by attributing to Him moral sentiments and feelings such as men could not entertain without the conviction that they were criminals. We do not believe that the Gospel is rightly preached when God is represented as an omnipotent, but arbitrary sovereign, who uses His creatures as His playthings, damning some for His glory, and punishing one for the sins of another; or when He is represented as an omnipotent monster, whose wrath can be appeased and favor secured, like that of Moloch, by the sight of blood and torture, whether of beast or man. Nor do we believe that the Gospel is rightly preached when sinners are told, in effect, that they may continue to live in sin, and yet be esteemed righteous before God on account of the satisfaction of Christ, if only they believe certain doctrinal propositions, and entertain certain emotions in regard to them. We believe that

*The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a memorial of the death of Christ, is a symbolical representation of this mutual reconciliation of God and man, but at the same time also the divine sign and seal of that mystical or vital union of believers with Christ which is the objective ground of this reconciliation and the necessary condition of eternal life.

the Gospel of reconciliation is only preached in its true sense when God is represented as Supreme Reason and Supreme Love, the eternal Father of spirits, whose moral principles and modes of action in reference to His children are not different from those which commend themselves to the most enlightened Christian conscience. And we are sure that in no other sense or form will the Gospel be largely accepted by the age in which we live. This age will not endure a Gospel that is in conflict with the moral principles and sentiments which distinguish the best ethical thinking of the time. We may fret because of this, and deplore what we may be pleased to call the advance of rationalism and infidelity, but that will not turn the world back half a millenium of years, and replace those ages in which theories that are now worn out found easy acceptance. We are sure, further, that the only Gospel that can do our age any good, must be one, not of moral fictions, but of realities. Notions of a transference of moral qualities from one subject to another, of substitutionary punishment of sin, and of justification by the imputation of a foreign righteousness, can no longer satisfy the moral sense, nor excite to high moral living. The age has had enough both of *solifidianism* and of *emotionalism*, and needs to be told now that the only kind of faith that is justifying and saving is that which works by love, and leads to the formation of Christian or Christ-like character. Christ must be set forth, not as a substitute for human righteousness, but as the author of righteousness and sanctification in men—the personal manifestation of the righteousness of God, through communion with whom by faith men are to become righteous, and holy, and blessed.

II.

CONDITIONS OF UNION BETWEEN NON-EPISCOPAL AND EPISCOPAL CHURCHES.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF, D.D.

I PROPOSE to discuss in this paper the conditions of union between non-episcopal and episcopal churches. This discussion I take to be in the line of Christologic thinking, as this was brought into flow by the master-spirits of our Mercersburg school four or five decades ago. We live to see the ideas which they advanced in broad sweep and stupendous popular force. They are championed no longer by a few select geniuses in an obscure, secluded locality of a great Commonwealth, and that against deep-rooted universal prejudice; but they have come to be the voice of God in the convictions of the people, and are ringing up and down and hither and thither throughout all the length and breadth of the land and of the world as the glad harbingers of the coming of a great and blessed day. Hence it is comparatively easy to solve the sublime problem of church union, even where radical differences in doctrine and polity have made such union impossible in former days. And yet I am fully conscious that the work of discussing the conditions of union is both extremely difficult and delicate. The historic traditions of the churches are deeply rooted in the noblest and best convictions of the people, and they cannot be broken and moulded in a day. Still, they are being broken, and reconstructed, and unified; and if it is yet difficult and delicate to tell just how the thing is being done, it is perfectly in keeping with good sense and judgment to point out some of the conditions under the control of which the movement is bound to go forward.

My subject is formulated in the mildest terms possible. Assumptions are not hinted at as ruling on either side of the great and blessed brotherhood of God's household. All are allowed to stand on common Christologic ground, and conditions are looked for that will answer the wants and destinies in the historic movements and triumphs of the holy Church Catholic of Jesus Christ. If any one undertakes to discuss a subject like this, he must be a man of charity in the broadest Christian sense, or he will be in imminent danger of spoiling his case. But he will have to be just as much a man of enlightened discrimination, or else, by too much charity, he will make a sorry muddle of grand historic issues. History must be allowed to speak by its own plain facts and creations. The growth of the times must not be passed by as having settled nothing in reply to the demands of any questions of divine right and prerogative. Facts must be met and applied as they stand, although by the force of them many a favorite theory of long standing and hoary supremacy will come to grief, and worn-out usages will be turned into dust, only that the normal growth of a more perfect state of the Christian life may rise and reign.

Diocesan episcopacy has been the subject of much controversy, especially in modern times. Much effort has been made to establish its claim of exclusive divine right in ecclesiastical polity. These efforts have failed, and the history, life and work of non-episcopal churches stand out as a tangible protest made by the voice of God in the course of human events against any such narrow construction of the polity of the Church. It is no longer an unsettled question whether presbyters and bishops, in apostolic and primitive times, were office-bearers of the same rank and order, or whether the one stood above the other in rank and authority. The one name had reference then to the dignity of the pastoral calling, and the other name to the duties which belonged to the office. But as time passed on and the Church grew, the bishop asserted his supremacy, and the elder was brought down to a

lower grade. This historic conclusion, as we now have it by incontrovertible testimony and agreement, disposes of the notion that diocesan episcopacy came in at the beginning by divine commission as the one form of polity and government of the Church in all ages. The apostles have written nothing bearing testimony of this kind. This is so generally admitted that it is not necessary to spend any time in trying to prove it.

And as to what the early fathers have written on this question, it needs only to be stated that throughout the first century and the early years of the second, these fathers do not recognize any difference between presbyterial and episcopal bishops. These differences came later. Then the eldership was made local and subordinate, and episcopacy was lifted to the level of a higher order. This change came by the pressure of the times and in accord with the prevailing circumstances and usages. Presbyter-bishops came in from the Jewish side of the life of their day, and the later prelatic episcopacy sprang from the Gentile environments of the early Church. And this prelatic growth of the times did not stop when it had come to co-ordinate dioceses. It ran up into patriarchates and archiepiscopal dioceses, until it finally culminated in the full-fledged hierarchy which had the bishop of Rome as its supreme head.

This is a brief outline of a gigantic historical development, and I have made it to call attention to the fact that the historic episcopate must rest its claims on this historic principle of historical development rather than on the ground of exclusive divine commission and right. We are living at too late a day, and have before our eyes the practical results of too many ecclesiastical orders and politics, to yield very readily to any exclusive hierarchical demands, whether these be of ancient or modern type and temper. As an efficient normal factor and force, prelacy is worthy of high consideration and respect; but when it becomes exclusive and claims superior and supreme dignities on the basis of divine appointment and right, then it

may and must be challenged to present its credentials of an unbroken succession.

It used to be the custom of Protestant bodies to act upon a theory of repristination. They did not base their claims on the theory of development in the life and growth of the Church, but on the notion that they were exact reproductions of some previous condition of church life and polity fixed by divine authority. Hence they overleaped the organic culture of the middle ages, and went directly to the Bible or some period of the early Church for their measure of creed and custom. This was doing a thing in a stiff, mechanical way which can only be accomplished by the plastic forces of organic life. Methods and theories of this kind are no longer as popular as they were one day. It is now well understood that no exact formal restoration of former periods of life is at all possible, and that neither the forces of nature or of grace can be made to run in such rigid mechanical grooves. The idea of development, of evolution, of growth in organic process and culture, is much more to the taste of truly enlightened modern Christian thinking than any habit of mechanical reaction and revival of dead issues. And if the doctrinal types of theological opinions and the religious customs and usages of past ages are compelled to yield to the moulding force and freedom of our modern life, why should the peripheral structure of government and clerical orders not surrender to the same historic test? If diocesan episcopacy is bound to insist on its exclusive dignity and right, why should it stop short with the patristic era as the model and measure of its claims? It would be wiser, one may be allowed to suppose, and more in keeping with the growth of ideas, to take in the full scope of the ages from the apostles down with a view of getting to a satisfactory solution of this vexed question.

And again, much of the popular Christianity of the day is severely legalistic. It lays more stress on the formal authoritative commands of our Lord than on the power of His life. Our Baptist brethren insist on the necessity of immersion, which

they take to be commanded and legally ordained in the commission to baptize. Of course our Lord made baptism a law to govern His people. Still, He was no mere legalistic commander, either in this or in any other transaction, but rather the personal head and giver of a new life. To be ingrafted into Him, and to be made a new creature in Him, is the sense and design of the baptismal commission and ordinance, and to narrow down this solemn sacramental transaction to one rigidly defined method, and that on the ground simply that so it is divinely commanded and ordained, while it is stripped, perhaps, of all saving grace, is too dry and stiff a species of evangelical orthodoxy to cope with the warm and generous temper of this Christologic and happy age. There are comparatively few who would be willing to put the baptismal relation of believers to Christ into such graceless judicial limitations, and it is not at all likely that the Church Catholic will ever entertain the proposal to go back to immersion on the basis of a mere legalistic command. The Christology that will convert and save the world will be warmer and more vital than that. It will win and move and govern, not by the killing letter of unbending forms, but by the moulding spirit of a genial, elastic, Christian life.

But is not the exclusive episcopacy of our day yoked to the same narrow legalistic spirit? It has a broader and more continuous historic past to fall back on than baptistic immersionism. Its ancestry runs through the ages, from the primitive periods down, and its constituency has always been large and influential. Nevertheless it rests too much on the formal and secondary conditions of our holy religion to thrust itself in the way of the Catholic sympathy and growing Christologic unification of the churches. The Christian life lies deeper than forms, and it is a serious mistake to make the narrow stem-pipe of Episcopal ordination the channel through which this life must necessarily flow. The Anglican Church has been the main Protestant champion of this clerical theory. But this church was not of this mind from the start. Had her hierarchy re-

mained loyal to the pope, as did the national hierarchies in continental Europe, the Church of England would have become presbyterial along with the rest. But as the bishops went with the king against the pope, Episcopacy remained in hierarchical force. And yet it fraternized with the Protestant presbyterial world. Henry VIII. sent two invitations urging Melancthon to visit England, and this masterly genius of the German reformation was offered the chair of divinity at Cambridge. Cranmer invited Melancthon, Calvin, Bullinger, and other continental reformers to assist the English reformation. Martyr was made a canon, and Bucer was made a divinity professor at Cambridge. This indicates a close fellowship between the Anglican Church and the non-Episcopal Churches of Europe in those days. Exclusive Episcopal high churchism came in later. It rose, and grew, and took firm root during the struggles of the established hierarchy with the Puritan sects. Then it was that Anglican episcopacy became partisan and refused to recognize presbyterial ordination. It abandoned its original genius of a broad-minded, evangelical freedom, and fell back into the limitations of an unhistorical formalism. Therefore it is in the same legalistic ship with the Baptists, and is ruled by the same antiquated bearings. To make it possible for non-Episcopal bodies to unite and co-operate with it in the great work of the Church, it will have to return to the better spirit of the Anglican reformation, and thus put itself on a level with the liberal tendencies of the times. Are there any indications that this kind of revival is in progress, and that it may be expected to go forward?

Archdeacon Farrar declares that the distinction between "bishop" and "presbyter" is not found in the New Testament.

Dean Stanley says: "It is certain that throughout the first century, and for the first years of the second, that is, through the latter chapters of the Acts, the Apostolic Epistles, and the writings of Clement and Hermas, bishop and presbyter were convertible terms."

And again he says: "In the first ages there was no such marked distinction as we now find between the different orders of the clergy. It was only by slow degrees that the name bishop became appropriated to the chief pastor raised high in rank and station above the mass of the clergy."

And the Rev. Edwin Hatch, M.A., in the Bampton Lectures of 1880, makes extensive use of his profound and liberal scholarship to show how this change in the appropriation of this name was brought about, and how the lines between the orders of the clergy came to be more rigidly drawn.

When public functionaries like these speak out so emphatically in a matter which so seriously concerns them and the organization to which they belong, it may be taken that the broad churchism of Archbishop Cranmer and his era is once more in vital force, and that it is bound to grow. But there are stronger evidences that such is the case than any individual declarations. The people of England had a stormy history of long duration. They manfully fought the ancient notion of the divine right of kings, and they succeeded in leaving that behind as a worn-out fossil of the past. To-day they have not only their royalty and constitutional monarchy, but the nation stands in the front rank of Anglo-Saxon freedom and self-control. And they are bound to advance further. In spite of their conservatism and love of the past, they will not fail to move with the vital issues of Christian civilization. And if in this ruling temper of progress they find the dogma of the divine right of bishops and the orders of the clergy too narrow to serve their broad, progressive aims, they will likely dispose of this hindrance in the same spirit in which their main political trouble was gotten out of the way.

And as for the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, this is more fully under the moulding forces of the times than the State Church of the mother country. Many of her leading minds are in full sympathy with the generous movements of our American civilization. This church, therefore, is not likely to commit the folly of defeating its prospects for growth and enlargement, just for the sake of glorifying and

perpetuating a dogmatic exclusiveness of her clerical organization. She has made overtures of union already to non-Episcopal bodies. In these she has reasoned freely and earnestly of the necessity of the historic episcopate. But she is aware, no doubt, that this is not just the same thing to the non-Episcopal mind of the stupendous forces of Protestantism that it is to her own mind, and that if the question of union is once seriously taken up she must be willing to measure herself generously with her Protestant neighbors, with whom she will have to stand or fall in the destiny of modern Christendom.

But it is time we should stop reading lectures to churchmen and prelatie hierarchies, with a view to bring them to their sober historical senses, and begin the more heroic work of finding and pointing out our own faults and mending our own defects. For it may as well be understood and acknowledged by all whom it may concern that this problem of church union will never be solved in a onesided way. Non-episcopal and episcopal bodies will not join and blend in that fashion.

There are but few essential differences of order and polity on the non-episcopal side. Perhaps the entire family of churches and sects of this type may be marshaled under the two distinctive heads of congregational independency and presbyterial representative organization and authority. Let us turn our critical eye on these and see whether there is anything for them to give up or to appropriate, in order that the beneficent growth of unification may be mightily helped forward and the final universal triumph of the Christian faith be speedily secured.

Congregationalism has been a great power in its day. And it is still a mighty factor in the life of the age. And no doubt it has served a magnificent purpose in the economic world-growth of evangelical Christendom. In theory it was too individualistic and fragmentary to promise commanding strength, but in practice it made up largely for its organic weakness by its immense popular energy and aggressive enterprise. Puritanism, in England and in this country, has made its mark and

embedded its principles in sufficient character and depth never to see its roots pulled up or its life destroyed. Yet this gives it no title of divine right, as over against other orders and systems of polity, either in the past or the present. Under the circumstances it could not have taken the place of the Romish episcopate, in the interest of European Christianity and civilization, during the dark days of the decline and fall of the Roman empire. And now again, in the broad flow of modern ideas and the rapid sweeping movement of modern life, both secular and religious, this system of organic independency is strongly reminded of the need of authoritative and centralizing power for the purposes of practical government and work. And it is said that for this reason there is a marked tendency in New England society towards the episcopal system. Truly the times change and our best Christian convictions change with them. And this fact is no cause for reproach and want of confidence, but it is rather a sign and seal of the fulfillment of the promise that there shall be progress and that humanity shall rise higher in the arts of freedom through the live agency and culture of the churches. But if New England inclines towards episcopacy, is it that of prelatic exclusiveness? Or is the presiding eldership the presbyterial superintendency, which comes in simply as an official expediency and need, and not as a divine order of binding plan and distinction? And which of the two schemes would likely be most effective in the buoyant flow and admirable self-poise of our modern Christian manhood?

New-England Puritanism, in creed and custom, has been all along a Calvinistic growth of the Westminster type. Only in its theory of Church Government did it differ radically from the presbyterial wing of the Calvinistic family. The followers of George Fox and Elias Hicks pushed their opposition to clerical Church organization a great deal further. These mild-mannered extremists rooted up the ideal of an ordained clergy and pastoral service altogether, and put themselves in direct communication with God through the Spirit. This was flying in

the face of all Christendom, and yet Quakerism has been an element of wonderfully effective force in the religious and social life of both England and America. In both countries the Quakers have made themselves felt and respected in the most advanced movements of intellectual, social, moral, and benevolent enterprise, and in Pennsylvania and other sections of this country they are still prominent in the leading issues of modern progress. This does not prove that the unclerical and unsacramental notions of these people must be acknowledged as biblical and orthodox. Much less does it show that their theory of church organization and divine service must be taken as of divine right and obligation for all other ecclesiastical bodies. But it is one of the many evidences that the grace and power of the Christian life is not necessarily confined to the fixed grooves of one specific order. Modern Christianity has a full variety of schemes and systems of organization, and through all of these has the Lord perfected His work and Kingdom. And thus we are compelled to see and feel that questions of polity and government are left to human agency and judgment under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and this question must therefore be given over to the forces of historical development and taken out of the courts of a distinctive divine law.

Presbyterianism is recognized as a very positive factor in ecclesiastical polity. It would be a source of honest pride and a cause for much exceeding great rejoicing to us and all who are in this system and bound to it by the ties of an intelligent loyal affection, if at last we could firmly believe and just as firmly say that this is the one scheme of organization and government which is perfect and entirely equal to all the economic demands of the churches. It is ancient and claims to be older than diocesan episcopacy. It is modern and makes the ideal of equality one of its cardinal maxims. It legislates and governs by representative power and authority. It has its pastors, its ruling elders, and its deacons. It has its consistory or sessions, its classes or presbyteries, its district synods,

and its general synods or general assemblies. The lay and clerical representation in its judicatories is as much as possible equally divided. It is government of the people, by the people, for the people. All this bespeaks for it the respectful consideration of this democratic age, and seems to give it the right to put itself forward as a complete product of ecclesiastical republicanism. Unfortunately, however, it does not answer fully to this high popular ideal. Our civil system goes much further in the matter of complete organization. We in the Church have no separate legislative, judicial, and executive departments. We give all these powers to one and the same judicatory, and hence we often lack executive headship and practical efficient management. In the State this would not be recognized as normal republican organization, and it is doubtful whether the Church can much longer be persuaded that it needs no reconstruction in order to make it a polity up fully to the broad demands of modern evangelical churchism. Of course this question of reconstruction and completion is only suggested here without any design or attempt to answer and settle it. The settlement will come as the urgent needs of the times will require, and it will then be conducted and brought to a satisfactory conclusion as the Christian common sense charged with the issue will by the help of God determine.

One hundred years ago the Methodists in this country were a small body of Christian people numbering about fourteen thousand. They had their chapels, their societies, their preachers, for years in the old country and here also, but all this while they held on to the Anglican Episcopate and looked to the Church of England for ordination and the sacraments. The revolutionary war shattered the established Church in this country, and the Methodists were compelled to provide for themselves. They took measures to do this, and in their weakness and their poverty they laid the foundations of a polity which has come to stand among the ecclesiastical systems of this great nation as perhaps the strongest and most efficient organization Protestant Christianity has yet developed. Wesleyan

Methodism took hold of the laity and enlisted their energies in church work. It retained the episcopate, and that in a much more centralized and compact form than in the mother church. With its bishops and presiding elders it held full sway over its itinerant pastors, its local preachers, and its class-leaders, while all the time it invited, urged, and demanded the spontaneous and untrammelled co-operation of the people. Thus it made itself in an eminent degree a government of the people, by the people, for the people, although it was in form an episcopal hierarchy of the most positive kind. What this system has done, what it is doing, and what it is in a condition yet to do in the growth of this nation and the development of the Kingdom of Christ in the world, need not now be told. It is enough to say that it is a success, a magnificent success in modern ecclesiastical organization and practical church work. But of course we need not therefore go into enthusiastic ecstasy while we think and say that this is the one system which all the world must receive and adopt. We are not out on any such glorification mission here and now. But we may at least modestly and calmly suggest that the champions and intelligent defenders of other polities and systems of government might possibly profit by carefully studying the make-up and success of the Methodist Episcopal organization. And further we may venture to prophesy that, though Methodist Episcopacy may fail to become the polity of a united Christianity, it will beyond doubt have a prominent share in moulding and framing the polity of the coming church catholic. Would not its presbyterial episcopate and presiding eldership have helped our German churches immensely? Would it not have made the Presbyterian Church, north and south, more successful? Was there not a great want of flexibility of executive power? These are questions, not for passion and partisan narrowness, but for a rational, fair-minded, intelligent Christian common-sense to take up and dispose of.

The problem of union is now forcing itself upon the attention of Christendom as it did not at any previous time. When some

of us were buoyant, frisky school-boys, the current of Protestant life ran violently towards division and seeming disintegration. That may have been a historic necessity, but that we have had quite enough of it everybody is coming to realize. At this day the cry for unification is floating in the air, and the current of thought and of measures is tending towards unity. If good has come out of a multitude of divisions, it may be summed up largely in the fact that these divisions have prepared the way for a unity such as would not have been possible without the experience of a much-divided Church. Thus evil has done its perfect work that good may come. No doubt God is in history. He met Moses in the burning bush. He presided especially over the destiny of His people Israel. Greece and Rome, in the days of their ancient glory, did not fail to do a good work for the accomplishment of His world-historic aims. And when Christ came and the Gentiles were called to be fellow-heirs with the Jews in the kingdom of heaven, the stream of history began to flow in Christologic force as the power of God unto salvation. And surely this power did not cease to work and to save when the mad spirit of schism took possession of the Christian mind, and tore the body of the Christ into warring fragments. But now union is called for, prayed for, worked for, and such a state of the popular mind is never without urgent, pungent reasons.

We are made to feel, and that by the agency of the Holy Ghost, that all shall and must be one in Christ as Christ and the Father are one. This was the Christo-centric ideal and power, in the full glow of which the Apostles laid the foundations of the Church. It was in force in the primitive and the middle ages, and it certainly did not drop out of history during the ebbs and flows of our modern period. This Christ power of unity, it is true, has been much and long covered by thick, dark, portentous clouds, but back of these the Sun of righteousness was ever shining and glowing, and now it is going on shining and glowing unto the perfect day. Hence dogmatic sectarian differences are giving way, and Christologic harmony is coming to the front.

And the Spirit of God worketh with the spirit of the times. Life is broadening. Social, civil, commercial energy is reaching out in all directions, determined to develop every resource and use every power in the interest of mankind. This can only be done by unified efforts and movements of the broadest kind. It is no wonder, therefore, that this state of popular feeling has its effect on the churches, and helps them to enter more readily and successfully into the current of Christologic unification among themselves. And thus the holiest and the best interests of progressive humanity will be secured both in Church and State.

And the days of the Gentiles seem to be fulfilled, and they are ready to come in like doves flying to their windows. But the divisions of the Church hinder their coming. From the missionaries out among the heathen comes the appeal for greater unity, and this constrains the people in the home field to give heed to the call. But what can be done to bring about a union that is so urgently called for?

Sometimes it is suggested that denominational organizations and standards should be abandoned, and all should come together with the Bible simply as their rule of faith. This method is unhistorical and is evidently out of the question. A union of denominations would be normal, and therefore possible. Such of these as are nearest alike in creed and custom should find it comparatively easy to make themselves one, and those even which differ radically in some things, may find it possible to overcome their differences and unite nevertheless. Our Reformed Church, with her Heidelberg Catechism, is very much alike with the Church of England and her Thirty-nine Articles. There is a difference in polity, but shall this remain a perpetual barrier to fraternal and organic fellowship between us, especially if others will be joining hands all around? And with Methodism we differ in polity and in our educational theory of religion, but as the episcopate of the M. E. Church is essentially presbyterial, it should be no obstacle at all, and it should not be impossible to blend revivalism of an evangelical character with the genius and methods of a sound educational Christian culture. And so on to the end of the list.

It has not been my purpose in this paper to dictate terms and formulate plans of union. My aim has been simply to illustrate the theme in a practical way, with a view of bringing into notice the possibilities that might be involved in it. And I do most fervently hope and pray that what I have suggested for consideration will not hinder but promote the growth of unification among the churches. Schemes and plans I beg leave to pass over to the combined wisdom of all to whom the solution of the grand problem may be committed, while I simply venture the remark: if no such possibilities as I have referred to exist, then the idea of church-union must be abandoned and Protestantism stands convicted of the crime of schism. And if we have not the capacity to look this plain issue squarely in the face and to meet it regardless of partisan considerations, we may as well stop all sentimental talk about any coming unity, and devote ourselves as best we can to Christian work as we are able to grasp it. But are we prepared to give up the great and urgent problem of our age in this narrow and cowardly spirit? Rather let us pray that these disorders be restored and these divisions healed, and work with all our might that our prayer may be realized. And who can calculate the full measure of the sublime and beneficent consequences of a free and voluntary union of the confessional organizations of the Church? Would not this be one of the movements that would make the united body really and truly "bright as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners?" It is true, mere formal, federal or organic union would not do this, and ecclesiastical machinery of the most complete and approved kind might even be a hindrance to the higher and grander unity in spirit. What is wanted is unified organization and machinery moved and guided by the enlightened energies of a thoroughly Christian age. Such an age will not resort to the carnal despotism of by-gone days; it will not fall back into the temper of heathenish cruelty and violence for the purpose of serving the cause of Christ and of humanity. But it will just as devoutly keep clear of that wicked spirit of self-will which

bids defiance to all lawful authority and breaks the body of Christian believers into a thousand jarring and conflicting sects.

As far as we can see, there is much room for doubting that union on a large scale can be speedily brought about. But this is no cause for discouragement when we consider the many conflicting interests and sacred responsibilities this grand project involves. When the first notes of Christologic theology were sounded by our Mercersburg school, there was an universal suspicion and strong protest. If we had then been told that by this time there would be such a state of things as now prevails, we would probably have demanded tangible proof as a necessary condition of belief. But to-day we thank God that we yet live and see the changes which time and divine supremacy have brought about. Are we not sure now that historical development is no mere theory or figment of the brain but a fact, and force, the beneficent creations of which cannot fail to be seen and understood? And if such things have happened within the short span of our lives, why may not like and even greater things happen in days to come? The issues of the times run in the line of progress. The secular world moves in grand sweep. Shall the churches stand still, and doubt and quibble? Is it not the high calling of these confessional standard-bearers of our undoubted Christian faith to take the lead in the culminating movements of modern history? And, if for any fault of their own, they fail to do this and lose their hold on the masses, who will be to blame at the bar of common sense and at the bar of God? The time has fully come for united action, and the churches will have to so organize that, in the benign spirit of our Lord, they can say to this man, Go; and he goeth, and to that man, Come; and he cometh, and to a third, Do this; and he doeth it. If humanity has a mission and a destiny which must be reached by well-directed Christian energy and work, then let the issues of our day be squarely met and the results be left in the hands of Him who doeth all things well. And to Him who sitteth upon the throne be power and dominion and glory and praise, world without end.

III.

A COMPARISON OF BRAHMANISM AND BUDDHISM WITH CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

BRAHMANISM, or Hinduism,* is the ancestral faith of the Hindu people—that Aryan race which, in pre-historic times, descended upon the fertile plains of the great Indian peninsula. Of all the religions which in vigor exist to-day, with a liturgy, literature and a well-defined system of doctrines and discipline, this is perhaps the oldest. Before Moses gave laws to the Israelites it is probable that the hymns of the Rig Veda were sung. At any rate, the antiquity of some of these poems cannot be computed. Brahmanism is to-day the orthodox faith of the Indian peoples. A cult so venerable and yet so vigorous is well worthy of study.

The doctrines of Hinduism offer resemblance to Christianity in the following particulars: There was originally an attempt made to grasp the thought of one Supreme Being, from whom proceeded all things. The monotheistic basis of this religion appears in its earliest hymns, as well as in the philosophical creed of its later Purānic period. And this is no less the case even if it assumed, as it did, a pantheistic form. The theology of Brahmanism is both evolutionary and pantheistic, and in this it does not prove false to that monotheistic conception which

* There is a distinction between the applications of these two words, though they are often used interchangeably. Brahmanism should be the term used to designate the ancient and purer religion of India, and Hinduism the complicated system of caste usages and polytheistic doctrines which that religion presents in its modern forms. (See Monier Williams, "Hinduism," pp. 13, 85.)

finds utterance both in its earlier and later history.* Along with this, there was a doctrine of the Trinity. In the oldest of the Vedas, Agni, Indra and Surya appear as a triad of principal gods. These later appear as Siva, Vishnu and Brahma, who, with their female counterparts, were the origin of all things. Their functions were interchangeable, and each god might take the place of the other. The highest place was, however, assigned to Brahma, the creative principle.

In its idea of man and of salvation there is also a resemblance. Man is made in the image of the deity, and in union with him must find his fruition. To accomplish this, the subject must have a second or spiritual birth, must subordinate his senses to the guidance of reason and finally arise altogether superior to them, and must attain unto purity of life and knowledge of the deity. He must be trained thoroughly in the religion of the Brahmans, and must pay the four sacred duties or debts. These debts are: 1. To the gods, daily sacrificial rites; † 2. To the inspired seers of the Veda, in the daily reading of the Scriptures; 3. To the *manes* or spirits of his father and ancestors, discharged by leaving a son; 4. His debt to human kind, which he pays by hospitality and kindness. Before the soul enters its final consummation it must be freed from passion, sensual desire, must be affectionate toward all things and pure, and with resignation quietly await its release.

Brahmanism had its Sacred Scriptures, inspired of the gods, and to be read by every devout Hindu. Though both as to

* The Veda, the Upanishads and the philosophical works founded on them," says Professor Monier Williams, "teach pantheism pure and simple. But they do more—they propound a most subtle theory of evolution and development. Their doctrine is, that the one sole, self-existing Supreme Self, the only really existing Essence, the one Eternal Germ of all things, delights in infinite expansion, in infinite manifestations of itself, in infinite creation, dissolution and re-creation through the infinite varieties and diversities of operation."—"Hinduism," p. 86.

† The sacrificial system of the ancient Hindus was of vast extent, and is connected with the earliest development of their religion. These sacrifices were at first thank-offerings and for the sustenance of the gods, but some of them were afterwards considered as expiatory.

form and contents these voluminous writings stand on an entirely different plane from those of the Christian religion, to which they are vastly inferior, yet they are considered of great weight. There was also a priestly class, whose only right it was to teach and expound the sacred text.*

Like Christianity, Brahmanism has its prayers, its religious consecration of the family and domestic life, its systems of philosophy and its numerous sects.

Taking a view of particular phases of Christianity and Hinduism, we see other striking resemblances. In the Hindu notion that the soul can only be reunited to Brahma by getting a correct idea of the latter and of itself, there is an approach to the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed that salvation is only possible through a belief in certain abstract and mysterious propositions concerning God, the Trinity and the Incarnation, and a similarity also to much popular preaching concerning the terms of salvation. The later teaching of the Hindu pundits, and which became the creed of the educated, that the Supreme Soul, or Brahman (neuter), is the only reality, and that the world has claim to notice only so far as it emanated from this being, reminds us of much philosophical speculation in the Christian Church. The later Hindu doctrine of metempsychosis, being founded on the notion that the human soul is of the same nature with the absolute God, and that it must therefore be purified of all earthly and sinful elements, and be at last made perfect in absorption in him, allies itself to the Christian doctrine of the necessary purification of the soul before it shares

* The inspiration of the Vedas was of that Pythonic or mantic kind in which there was a complete annihilation of the human personality. "According to the Brahmanical theology," says Dr. Robson, for many years resident in India, "the Vedas came to earth in the same way [in which Mohammed received the Koran]. They are called 'that which is heard.' The authors heard them in a trance and repeated them. Of this there is no consciousness whatever in the Vedas themselves. The writers write as any lyricists would. There are invocations to the deities similar to those at the beginning of the Homeric poems. These indicate a desire for what there is no consciousness of possessing." ("The Bible: its Revelation, Inspiration and Evidence," p. 262.)

the vision of God, which purification must in some cases go on after death.

On the other hand, the Indian theology is separated from Christianity by many fundamental differences.

Although a striving after monotheism ever and anon appears in the Hindu writings, Brahmanism presents a polytheism of the most exaggerated and debased character. The multiplication of deities has gone on to such an extent that one authority puts the number at three hundred and thirty million. The lowering of the original pantheism and nature-worship has also proceeded apace, so that modern Hinduism presents the unique spectacle of a religion combining a lofty philosophical theism with a puerile fetichism, or adoration of animals, stones, trees and various inanimate things. Even in its best forms, the Indian theology never grasped with firmness the conception of an intelligent, personal Creator. Neither is it consistent in its account of the universe, because now it represents the universe as evolved from the consciousness of the existent One by will and desire, and now as eternally existing, though in darkness and unknown.

Its system of caste is also at the opposite pole from the Christian conception of man. This system is founded on a religious, and not on a social basis. It divides men into three (or perhaps four) arbitrary divisions, which are as well defined and as immutable as the judgments of the Last Day. This religious separation of society controls the industrial sphere, confining certain occupations to certain castes, as if all work were not equally noble. The men of the lowest caste are excluded from all knowledge of the Scripture and of the expiation of sin. Christianity, however, makes no distinctions in its callings, unites man in an equal fraternity by its doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood, and invites every one to the highest of its privileges.

The Hindu method of salvation is also at a great remove from the Christian. And this in two points: First, in requiring every one who desires to obtain the utmost good at death

to go through four orders or stages of life, viz.: (1) that of a religious student; (2) that of a householder; (3) that of an anchorite, and (4) that of a religious mendicant. These stages are marked off by precise boundaries, and must all be passed through by him who would reach perfection. Marriage is one of the gates of salvation. In the final stages, the Hindu must leave his home, disengage himself from all family ties, repair to a lonely wood, and pass the rest of his life in poverty, bodily austerities, the study of the Vedas, meditation and prayer, until he reaches the unearthly condition of one to whom religious observances are unnecessary, who sustains his soul on the contemplation of the Deity, and, ever pure in mind, abides his time, until at last his soul is freed from its fetters, and is absorbed in the Eternal Spirit. The second point of difference is that this course of salvation is only theoretically binding, persons of the two lower castes being required to go through only the first and second stages. Between the men* of these different orders of attainment there is to be little intercourse; at least the righteous man is not allowed to associate or enter into any affinity with one not initiated. It will be seen how fundamentally this gradation of salvation differs from the Christian method, though it has a certain analogy with the Methodist division of believers into the justified and perfectly sanctified. Also, when the Hindu makes the last and highest act of his religion to be mendicancy and solitude, and when he supposes that perfection can be obtained only at the end of life and at the cost of isolation and bodily cruelties, he comes far below the teaching of Christ, who prayed that His disciples might not be taken out of the world, but kept from its evil.

Brahmanism has its sacrifices; but these are so many and so complicated that it is impossible to describe them. Suffice it to say that they are propitiatory and thank-offerings, and rarely consist of animal sacrifices. It is the opinion of many

* I say *men*, because women are left altogether out of the account in this ancient and modern religion. In a religious point of view, woman might be considered as having no personality. Her salvation is in utter subjection.

scholars that human sacrifices characterized the early Aryan religion; that they were largely practiced by the Druidian and other wild tribes, and were perpetuated for some time in the more secluded districts of India. The offerings of animals were carried on to a frightful extent for hundreds of years, until, about the fifth century before Christ, through the efforts of Buddha and other Brahman philosophers, the idea of the impossibility of vicarious suffering was brought in, and the blood service gave way to the peaceful oblations of gratitude and love. But not even the Jewish literature is so full of ideas of sacrifice, and in the ancient Vedic writings the sinner is he who does not offer sacrifices to the deities, and not he who violates the fundamental principles of right and wrong. In the later writings, however, ethical considerations are put forward.

The world-wide doctrine of the transmigration of souls finds its full flowing out in Hinduism. This doctrine is based on the belief that the world and the flesh are unreal and sinful, that all connection herewith must be entirely dissolved, and that all sins receive their retribution in the being born again in another form of animal or material existence, and that this regeneration must go on perpetually, or until the soul is entirely freed from bondage to evil, and is lost in the rapture of union with the infinite essence of the Eternal Spirit. The immortality of Brahmanism, therefore, is not a self-conscious, active existence, but an absorption after innumerable transmigrations into the impersonal, self-existent Brahma. How much this differs from the Christian doctrine of the future life it is unnecessary to say.*

* It would be very interesting to trace the forms which this belief in the transition of souls has assumed in the religions of the world. Among the aboriginal tribes of Africa and America, by the old Mexicans, by the Druids, in the Germanic mythology, in the faith of the ancient Egyptians, the Buddhists, by Pythagoras and Plato; in the mystical system of the Cabbala among the Jews, and by many of the early Christians, this doctrine has held a singular sway over the human mind. The German critic and philosopher, G. E. Lessing, endeavored to establish it on metaphysical grounds. "Since nature never takes a leap," he says, here anticipating the modern theory of evolution, "the

From this short survey, one can easily perceive how fundamentally at variance with Christianity is the ethnic religion of India. Its earliest form was its purest, and it is only by philosophical explanations and adaptations that the learned Hindu of to-day can adhere to the religion of his ancestors.* The his-

soul must have gone through all the lower stages before it arrived at that which it now occupies . . . and since nature contains many substances and powers which are not accessible to those senses with which it is now endued, it must be assumed that there will be future stages at which the soul will have as many senses as correspond with the powers of nature. And this very system is certainly the oldest of all philosophical systems; for it is, in reality, no other than the system of the pre-existence of the soul and metempsychosis, which did not only occupy the speculation of Pythagoras and Plato, but also, before them, of the Egyptians, Chaldeans and Persians—in short, of all the sages of the East; and this circumstance alone ought to work a good prejudice in its favor, for the first and oldest opinion is, in matters of speculation, always the most probable, because common sense immediately hit upon it." In recent times this belief has had an able advocate in Professor Francis Bowen, of Harvard College, who, in a long and interesting article in the *Princeton Review*, May, 1881, entitled, "The Christian Metempsychosis" (pp. 316-341), sets forth the reasons which have led him to embrace this as a highly probable and, withal, consolatory hypothesis. It would appear, however, that this belief had not reached a clearly developed form in the oldest Vedic literature, because there, according to Max Müller, the departed appear as fathers, or demi-gods, to whom worship is to be paid, whose will is to be obeyed, and whose affections are to be propitiated. This ancestor-worship seems inconsistent at least with the fantastic forms of transmigrations, which were afterwards so conspicuous a feature of the Indian religion. See Müller, "India: What Can It Teach Us?" pp. 237-246.

* "Starting from the Veda," says Professor Monier Williams, "Hinduism has ended in embracing something from all religions, and in presenting phases suited to all minds. It is all-tolerant, all-compliant, all-comprehensive, all-absorbing. It has its spiritual and material aspects, its esoteric and exoteric, its subjective and objective, its rational and irrational, its pure and impure. It may be compared to a huge polygon, or irregular multi-lateral figure. It has one side for the practical, another for the severely moral, another for the devotional and imaginative, another for the licentious and sensual, and another for the philosophical and speculative. Those who rest in ceremonial observances find it all-sufficient; those who deny the efficacy of works, and make faith the one requisite, need not wander from its pale; those who are addicted to sensual objects may have their tastes gratified; those who delight in meditating on the nature of God and man, the relation of matter and spirit, the mystery of separate existence, and the origin of

torical development of the Indian religion, in fact, offers an instructive parallel to that of Christianity. That parallel may be seen in these facts: In excluding the Sudras, or lowest caste, from reading the Scriptures and religious knowledge; in the high position and authority of the priestly class; in sacrificial rites being complicated with a great amount of ritualistic formulas and texts recited during the performance, and which required the employment of a number of professional Brahmanas, who had to be liberally rewarded for their services; in the performance of certain rare *śrauta* rites on exceptional occasions and at great expense; in the importance of hermit life and self-mortification; in the priest's giving sanction to practices which have no mention in ancient Hindu literature, as widow-suicide on the funeral bier of her husband, infanticide, and other horrible and cruel practices; in the disparity of the present worship and practice sanctioned in part by their later scriptures with the earlier theology; and in the persecuting spirit which it occasionally manifested. In the degeneration of the Aryan religion can we not see an exactly similar development to be suffered by the Christian faith?

Buddhism is the Protestantism of India. It arose as a reaction against the abuses and corruptions of the old religion. Its founder was Buddha ("the enlightened"), called also Siddhartha ("he who has accomplished his aim"), Gautama (his family name), and Sakya-muni ("the sage of the tribe of Sakya"), who lived in the sixth century B.C., and whose life presents a strange fascination, a fascination which lends itself to the religion which he founded. The self-renunciation of this prince, and his long and anxious search for truth and peace have formed the subject of Mr. Edwin Arnold's beautiful and noble epic, "The Light

evil, may here indulge their speculation. . . . Its present aspect is that of an ancient, overgrown fabric, with no apparent unity of design—patched, pieced, restored and enlarged in all directions, inlaid with every variety of idea, and although looking as if ready, at any moment, to fall into ruins, still extending itself so as to cover every hole and corner of available ground, and still held together because supported by a hard foundation of Brahmanism and caste."
—"Hinduism," pp. 12, 13, 84-86.

of Asia," which first brought to popular attention the features of that faith which is followed by one-third of the human race. Buddhism presents even more striking resemblances to Christianity than Brahmanism, on which it was founded and in the fundamental theological conceptions of which it agrees.

Buddhism springs out of the same idea of life and destiny as the religion we have considered, viz., that human existence is misery, that connection with matter is evil, and that the goal of humanity is Nirvana, that is, complete deliverance from forms, senses, contact, perception, desire, birth, misery, death. For reaching this goal, Buddhism presents many excellent recommendations, which, though chiefly ethical, are very similar with those with which Christianity has made us familiar.

Buddhism teaches that every action has an effect inherent in itself, and which works according to a law of causation. In this it resembles the Christian doctrine of the result of good and bad deeds affecting character, expressed by St. Paul, when he said, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." In its high estimation of virtue, it is also akin to Christianity. The way to Nirvana consists of eight things—right faith, right judgment, right language, right purpose, right practice, right obedience, right memory, and right meditation. In its ascetic recommendations to the religious to abstain from dances, theatres, luxury and personal ornaments, it allies itself to the Christian teaching of self-denial and the crucifixion of the flesh. Buddhism also places the highest value on charity—charity boundless in its self-abnegation and extending to every sentient being. It makes the greatest importance to attach to the virtues of purity, patience, courage, contemplation and knowledge. These tend directly "to conduct to the other shore." It enjoins the avoidance of all offensive and gross language and the making of quarrels. Patience under injury and resignation in misfortune are strongly inculcated. Humility is no less prominent. Confession of sin has also its place.

In the Buddhist doctrine of knowledge and contemplation

there is—in reference to our own religion—a resemblance and a difference. By knowledge of life, of its miseries, its inanity, the glory of complete deliverance from it, and by abstract contemplation, the soul becomes completely centered within itself and freed from all outward bonds.* Distinguish this from the Christian idea. So far as the Buddhist doctrine encourages a condition of apathy or trance-like separation from the concerns of this life—and such a conception is germane to much Eastern thought—it is quite removed from the spirit of Christianity.

In its belief that every mortal ought to aspire to the position of Buddha, that he occupies no higher place than can be reached by any of his disciples, this religion reminds us of the teaching of Christianity that Jesus Christ is the ideal and head of the human race, to reach perfect conformity with whom every man must aspire. In its spirit of comprehension and charity, Buddhism had a marked contrast to Brahmanism, and a notable likeness to Christianity in its relation to Judaism. It threw down all barriers, admitted all men to equal privileges, disregarded castes, and in a community where all had equally renounced the world, considered all as brethren. Also, in its

* Dr. Hermann Oldenberg has admirably contrasted Christ's simple and loving revelation of the Father with Buddha's metaphysical teachings. "It cannot be forgotten," he says, "that the fundamental differences of the thoughts and the dispositions with which the early Christian and early Buddhist communities dealt, were such that these differences must also find expression in the method of religious instruction. Where the pure sentiment of the simple believing heart is supreme, where there are children to whom the Father in heaven has given his kingdom to possess, there the brief and homely language, which comes from the depths of a pure heart, may touch the proper chords more effectually than the highly organized development of a system of ideas. But the mode of thinking of the world in which Buddha lived, moves in other paths: for it all weal and woe depend on knowledge and ignorance; ignorance is the ultimate root of all evil, and the so'e power which can strike at the root of this evil is knowledge. Deliverance is, therefore, above all, knowledge; and the preaching of deliverance can be nothing less or more than the exposition of this knowledge, which means the unfolding of a series of abstract notions and abstract propositions" ("Buddha; His Life, His Doctrine, His Order:" Tr. by W. Hoey, pp. 178-9). But the essentially ethical basis of Buddha's teachings must also be remembered.

emancipation of woman, who is admitted to equal religious rights with man, Buddhism anticipated Christianity. This is also true of its idea of humanity and its promise of salvation to all. In this it went far ahead of Judaism.

The early missionary spirit of Buddhism and the wide-spread diffusion of the faith by earnest and heroic missionaries mark a singular likeness to the early history of our own religion. It also had to endure its share of persecution.

Like Christ, Gautama won his way into the hearts of men by the power of his self-renunciation and of love which, to find life and salvation, gave up all things. He too laid down his life for the sheep. Christian writers have always been fond of dwelling upon the matchless character of Jesus, and they have insisted that His sway over the hearts of men is due, in large measure, to the beauty of His God-like life and to that wonderful love which led Him to sacrifice Himself for the world. And although it is altogether misleading and unfair to compare the son of Suddhodana with the Son of Mary, it is nevertheless true that the moral elevation and unselfishness of the Indian sage must be given a large influence in accounting for his power over such a vast portion of the human race. As

"Ever with the years
Waxed this compassionateness of our Lord,
Even as a great tree grows from two soft leaves
To spread its shade afar,"*

so has waxed the benign influence of that compassionateness over the Asiatic peoples. The greatness of his sacrifice and the conscientiousness of his search for the secret of joy and eternal peace on behalf of the world has never, I think, been denied.† Even the Rev. W. C. Wilkinson, who has set him-

* "Light of Asia," bk. i.

† Mr. Arnold has given eloquent expression to Gautama's high and holy resolve:

"If one, not tired with life's long day, but glad
I' the freshness of its morning,—one not cloyed
With love's delicious feasts, but hungry still;

self the task systematically to minimize all the worthy features of his religion, speaks of Buddha himself as "that noble and gentle spirit of ancient Indian paganism," "over whom one could weep tears of admiration." * The passionate devo-

If one not worn and wrinkled, sadly sage,
But joyous in the glory and the grace
That mix with evils here, and free to choose
Earth's loveliest at his will; one even as I,
Who ache not, lack not, grieve not, save with griefs
Which are not mine, except as I am man;
If such an one, having so much to give,
Gave all, laying it down for love of men,
And henceforth spent himself to search for truth,
Wringing the secret of deliverance forth,
Whether it lurk in hells or hide in heavens,
Or hover, unrevealed, nigh unto all;
Surely, at last, far off, some time, somewhere,
The veil would lift for his deep-searching eyes,
The road would open for his painful feet,
That should be won for which he lost the world,
And Death might find him conqueror of death.
This will I do, who have a realm to love,
Because I love my realm, because my heart
Beats with each throb of all the hearts that ache,
Known and unknown, these that are mine and those
Which shall be mine, a thousand million more,
Saved by this sacrifice, I offer now."—*Book IV.*

* "Edwin Arnold as Poetizer and Paganizer," p. 119; see also p. 111. This flippant and superficial review, in which rallery and ridicule do the work of sound criticism, fails entirely to appreciate either the poetic standpoint of Mr. Arnold or the teachings of Buddha, and also to discriminate between these teachings and the legends, glosses and casuistical explanations and corruptions of his followers. "By giving prominence to the extravagances and almost inconceivable absurdities with which the system has been overloaded," says the able writer of the article "Buddhism," in Chambers' *Encyclopædia*, "it would have been easy to make it look sufficiently ridiculous. But this is not to depict; it is to caricature. It is only too common for Christian writers to treat of heathen religions in such fashion. The only fair—the only true account of any religion is that which enables the reader to conceive how human beings may have come to believe it and live it." As to Mr. Arnold's poem itself, the *New Englander* (March, 1880) says: "It will not be strange if the book takes hold of the present and of a long future by a creative power of thought, which is the imagination of the inspired poets." See Dr. Holmes in *The International Review*, October, 1879.

tion of his early followers and their most extravagant language of adulation can only be explained by the profound impression made by his purity and unselfishness.* Dr. Rhys Davids speaks of the "mighty influence of Gautama's personal character," and Principal Caird, ascribing much of the success of Buddhism to the character of its founder, sums up the qualities of that character in these excellent words: "The story of Buddha's life brings before us the picture of a very rare and lofty nature. We seem to see in him a mind not only deeply reflective, but of great practical sagacity and insight, capable of profound and comprehensive views of life, able to discern the hidden causes of evils under which society labored, and to devise and apply the proper remedies. The impression, moreover, left on the mind by his whole career is that of a man who combined with intellectual originality other and not less essential elements of features, such as magnanimity and moral elevation of nature, superiority to vulgar passions, an absorption of mind with larger objects, such as rendered him absolutely insensible to personal ambition; also self-reliance and strength of will—the confidence that comes from consciousness of power and resource, the quiet, patient, unflinching resolution which wavers not from its purpose in the face of dangers and difficulties that baffle or wear out men of meaner mould. Along with these, we must ascribe to him other qualities not always or often combined with them, such as sweetness, gentleness, quickness and width of sympathy. . . . I do not think we shall err in conceiving of the character of Buddha as embracing that rare combination of qualities which lends to certain exceptive personalities a strange power over all who come within the range of their influence, calls forth the love and devotion of human hearts, welds together under a common impulse the diversified activities of multitudes, and constitutes its possessors the chosen leaders of mankind."† Akin to this acute judgment, Mr. Edwin Arnold speaks of "the perfect

* See T. W. Rhys Davids, "Hibbert Lectures," 1881, pp. 171-174.

† "Essay on Buddhism."

purity and tenderness of this Indian teacher, who united the truest princely qualities with the intellect of a sage and the passionate devotion of a martyr, and whose personality cannot but appear the highest, gentlest, holiest and most beneficent, with one exception, in the history of thought."* We may at least assume that the immense influence of Buddha is another lesson of the Cross,—the power of love and self-sacrifice, and that he thus presents a far-off parallel to Jesus Christ, whose greater sacrifice will yet draw his followers to Him, of whom the sage of Sakya was but an unconscious prophecy.

The remarkable resemblance to Christianity presented by this venerable and noble faith of India and Asia should not lead us to be blind to its still more fundamental differences.†

* "Light of Asia," pref.

† Before leaving this part of the subject it is worth while to mention that, like Christ, Buddha wrote nothing. His disciples, however, composed an ample literature, which contain the Sacred Scriptures of Buddhism, the canon of which was fixed by councils, and which must be read and discoursed upon in the public assemblies. So striking in fact are the analogies between the nobler parts of this religion and Christianity that some have supposed that there must be an historic or organic connection between them. "One could almost imagine," says Mrs. Speir, in her book on "Life in Ancient India," "that before God planted Christianity upon earth, he took a branch from the luxuriant tree and threw it down in India." It was a favorite idea of Schopenhauer's that Christianity drew many of its most characteristic features from this source. How little there is in common, however, between the inner spirit of Buddhism and that of Christianity, Professor H. N. Gardiner has well shown in his excellent remarks on "Schopenhauer as a Critic of Religion," in the *Andover Review*, July, 1888, pp. 11-14. Professor Rudolph Seydel, of the University of Leipzig, who claims to be a friend to Christianity and a strong believer in the historic Christ, has striven to prove in his two books, "Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha—sage und Buddha—Lehre," (Leip., 1882), and "Die Buddha Legende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien," (Leip., 1884), the dependence of the Gospel Story in many of its important incidents on the older Indian legends. This he has failed to do in the opinion of both Orientalists and exegetes. Professor J. E. Carpenter, an eminent Unitarian scholar and an unbiassed critic, says of his attempt: "Professor Seydel does not deny the radical differences of view which separate the teachings of Gautama Buddha from those of Jesus. How was it that, in spite of these incompatibilities, the incidents of the one legend should exert transforming and indeed creative power over those of the other?

Buddhism has no doctrine of God. Its philosophy is essentially atheistic. "The very idea of a God, as creating or in any way ruling the world, is utterly absent in the Buddhist system. God is not so much denied; He is simply not known. Contrary to the opinion once confidently and generally held,

How was it that the new handling of the tradition which must by hypothesis have taken shape at a distance remote from its principal depositories, should have so quickly displaced the received version current in centres of apostolic teaching? These are the questions which rise at once in connection with a theory of Buddhist influence on such a narrative as that of the temptation common to the first and third Gospels. Until Professor Seydel can offer much more satisfactory evidence than his general assumptions, we must declare his thesis 'not proven' (*Modern Review*, 1882, pp. 620-623, 1884, p. 397). In a letter to the secretary of Sion College in 1882, Professor Max Müller declares that he would be extremely grateful if anybody would point out to him the historical channels through which Buddhism influenced Christianity. "I have been looking for such channels all my life," he says; "but hitherto I have found none" (see "India: What it can Teach Us," p. 108). After speaking of the strange parallel between the Cakkavatti Buddha and the Messiah Logos of the Christians, Dr. Rhys Davids says: "There now arises the very natural question whether there is any proof that the Christian writers, who lived about five hundred years after the Buddhist writers, borrowed their ideas from India? The resemblances are so very striking that this question has often been unhesitatingly answered in the affirmative. . . . The fullest treatment of it from this last point of view is in a very learned work by a writer of thoroughly earnest and unbiassed mind; I mean the 'Angel Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians,' by Ernest de Bunsen. The curious reader will find in this volume a very exhaustive statement of all the possible channels through which such a borrowing by the Christians from the Buddhists can be supposed to have taken place. . . . I have carefully considered it throughout with a mind quite open to conviction, and I can find no evidence whatever of any actual and direct communication of any of these ideas from the East to the West. Where the Gospel narratives resemble the Buddhist ones, they seem to me to have been independently developed on the shores of the Mediterranean and in the valley of the Ganges; and strikingly similar as they often are at first sight, the slightest comparison is sufficient to show that they rested throughout on a basis of doctrine fundamentally opposed. If this view be correct, it remains therefore that the similarities of idea are evidence not of any borrowing from the one side or the other, but of similar feelings engendered in men's minds by similar experiences,—an explanation which fully accounts not only for all the similarities, but also for all the differences" ("Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by Indian Buddhism: Hibbert Lectures, 1881," pp. 147-152). If we compare the later

that a nation of atheists never existed, it is no longer to be disputed that the numerous Buddhist nations are essentially atheists; for they know no being with greater supernatural power than any man is capable of attaining by virtue, austerity and science; and a remarkable indication of this startling fact is to be seen in the circumstance that some at least of the Buddhist nations—the Chinese, Mongols and Thibetans—have no word in their language to express the notion of God.* "Buddha recognizes not a God upon whom man depends; his doctrine is absolutely atheistic."†

It follows from this that Buddhism has no explanation of the origin of the universe. It apparently pre-supposes the eternity of matter. At least, "it takes as its ultimate fact the existence of the material world and of conscious beings living within it; and it holds that everything is subject to the law of cause and effect, and that everything is constantly, though imperceptibly changing." All places and all existences are under this law. "The whole kosmos—earth and heavens and hells—is always tending to renovation or destruction; is always in a course of change—a series of revolutions or of cycles, of which the beginning and the end are alike unknowable and

Buddhist developments of the monastic system, especially as seen in Thibet, with the Christian monasticism, the resemblances are so striking that Ruffner thought that the latter was borrowed from the former. The whole worship, hierarchy, etc., of Lamaism, present a marvellous external resemblance to Romanism. See Rhys Davids, "Non-Christian Religious Systems: Buddhism," pp. 248-250; Schaff, "History of the Church," vol. iii., pp. 149-153 (last edition).

* Chambers, "Encyclopædia," s. v. "Buddhism." With this agree Duncker, "History of Antiquity," vol. iv., p. 341, R. Spence Hardy, "Manual of Buddhism," p. 413, and other authorities.

† Barth, "Religions of India," p. 110. "It will be readily acknowledged," says the Rev. S. Beal, "from our point of view, that Buddhism is an atheistic system. There is no word for God in Chinese Buddhist writings. . . . The infinite Buddhas are known, and a universal essence of *dharma* recognized, but not one God endowed with attributes and the Creator of all that exists" ("Buddhism in China," pp. 171, 185).

unknown. To this universal law of composition and dissolution, men and gods form no exception."*

True to the Eastern character, Buddhism accepts in its most exaggerated form the belief in the transmigration of souls. With this, of course, are bound up the ideas of the self-perpetuation of actions, the misery of human existence, and the necessity of new births until the soul is freed from its bondage. In the eternal and resistless sweep of the laws of causation and persistence of being, there is no room for the Christian dogmas of atonement, probation or retribution. No exterior power can destroy the fruit of a man's deeds; they must work out their full effect to the pleasant or the bitter end. This effect will be seen in the new being to be born out of the dying of the old; but this new phenomenon will be neither a matter of grace nor of punishment, but the blind resultant of changeless law. It is unnecessary to say that Buddhism knows nothing of any doctrine of the Fall or of depravity.†

This religion divides men into two classes,—those who have embraced the religious life, and the laymen, who are not ex-

* T. W. Rhys Davids, "Buddhism," p. 87. "Buddhism knows no world-Creator and no creation, no original Cause, no world-soul, no eternal matter; in a word, neither a personal nor non-personal, *supra-mundane* nor *ante-mundane* world-principle of any kind whatever" (Koeppen, "Die Relig. d. Buddha und ihre Entstehung," p. 228).

† It has sometimes been said that the Buddhists believe in probation after death. And this has been brought forward to discredit the theory of many Christian theologians that no man is finally rejected of God but him who has deliberately refused his Saviour Christ. But the Buddhists not only do not believe in a probation after death, they believe in no determining trial whatever in view of future rewards and punishment. Their whole theory of life and the hereafter is at the opposite pole from the Christian. "Gautama held that after the death of any being, whether human or not, there survived nothing at all but that being's Karma,—the result, that is, of its mental and bodily actions. . . . He had discarded the theory of the presence within each human body, of a soul which could have a separate and eternal existence. . . . In no case is there, therefore, any future life in the Christian sense" ("Hilbert Lectures, 1881," pp. 92, 93, 109). And this survival of the Karma was not for the purpose of further knowledge, or for reward or punishment, but was the result of the blind working out of the law of cause and effect.

pected in this life, at least, to attain a strong desire for emancipation from the evils of existence. It is also partial in its laying out of the moral duties, only the five main points being of universal obligation, viz., not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to lie, and not to be drunken. It also places the highest value on asceticism as the chief of all moral excellencies. There is, too, an innate selfishness in Buddhism, inasmuch as its moral precepts, noble as many of them are, are for the sole purpose of release from the curse of existence. Life is not a blessing, nor a sphere for lofty attainment nor large usefulness.

The heaven, or Nirvana, of the Buddhists is a complete deliverance from all the limitations of existence, and is either an annihilation or such an approach to it that to the Western mind there is not much to be preferred.*

Buddhism is the highest achievement of the Oriental mind in the realm of religion and morals. Dean Milman well calls

* There is a tendency among the recent investigators in the Indian cults to throw doubt upon the formerly universally received opinion that Nirvana is annihilation. They claim it means that saintship or perfection in which the soul is freed from Karma, or the necessity of re-birth into a material existence. It is a moral state, the highest possible, and may or may not lead to absolute extinction. This is the opinion of Max Müller (his later opinion, "Buddhaghosha's Parables," p. xli., not his former, "Science of Religion," p. 140), Prof. T. W. Rhys Davids ("Buddhism" [manual], pp. 115-123, "Hibbert Lectures, 1881, pp. 158-166), Prof. Childers ("Dict.," s. v. "Nibbanam," "Parinibbanam" and "Upadiseso"), Dr. Oldenberg ("Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order," tr. by W. Hoey, Lond. and Edinb., 1882, passim, and third excursus), Beal ("Buddhism in China," pp. 197-200), and Dr. Frankfurter (*Journal of Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 1880). It can be no longer doubted, at least, that Gautama taught that Nirvana is a state of holiness and knowledge which can be attained in this life. Drs. Frankfurter and Rhys Davids prove this beyond dispute. See also the latter's "Hibbert Lectures," Appendix X. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that the contemplative Eastern has none of our longing for an active eternal existence. He wishes either repose in the waveless bosom of Brahm or an everlasting rest in himself, without desire, without feeling, without thought, without a ripple to disturb the calm of his spirit disenthralled at last from the activities and pains of life.

it the "Christianity of the East,"* and no candid man can look upon it in its better aspects without feeling a generous admiration. As Christianity to Judaism and Protestantism to Romanism, so is Indian Buddhism to all that went before. It was a revolt against the exclusiveness and formalism and corruption of the elder cult, and an attempt to render it more human and catholic. It extended sympathy and salvation to all, and was the first religion to comprehend the idea of humanity. Like all religions, it has degenerated, and it has proved impotent for the regeneration of society, for universal conquest or for adaptation to an advanced condition of civilization. In its best estate, and with all its strange fascination and many noble features, it breaks down where Christianity is strong, because it has no doctrine of God, of sin, of salvation through an Almighty Redeemer, and of eternal life.

* "Hist. of Christianity," vol. i., p. 102, note.

IV.

WATER IN NATURE AND GRACE.

BY REV. D. B. LADY, A.M.

LIFE depends upon the presence of water. It is essential alike to vegetable and animal existence. It is indispensable to the world's being, and to the world's productions, and to the world's population. The industries and the arts of men could not be carried on without it. And it is a matter worthy of the highest gratitude that this important factor of our physical well-being is at hand in such inexhaustible quantities wherever mankind has found a home.

The cup of cold water is a priceless boon to the tired laborer struggling with his task, under the burning rays of a July sun. The wounded soldier, left lying for hours upon the battle-field, as his comrades press forward to victory or are driven back in defeat, faint with the loss of blood, forgets his hunger in the agony of his pain, but cries out for water as the one thing upon which his longings are concentrated. The traveler, whose hungry heart has carried him far from the spot where his eyes first looked out upon a world of beauty, as his recollections return to the scenes of his early years, thinks most fondly of the spring, or the well, or the old oaken bucket, at which he was once accustomed to slake his thirst. Water is a large part of the subsistence of man. It refreshes him when wearied. It keeps the casket of his soul pure and healthy. It cleanses his clothing. It cooks his food. And it makes up by far the largest part of the material of which his body is composed.

The sparkling dewdrops, distilled upon the earth under the silent stars, and the gentle rains furnish the soil with its needed moisture, cause vegetation to spring forth, and assist in dress-

ing the fields in their garments of green. They would make even the desert to bloom and blossom as the rose, if haply they should descend upon its arid wastes. The earth welcomes the rains, and nature and man grow glad at their coming.

“ Sound of vernal showers
On the twinkling grass
Rain-awakened flowers,
All that ever was

Joyous and clear and fresh, thy music doth surpass.”

From the quiet brook, making its way between grassy bank and through flowery meadows, the murmuring rivulet, tumbling over obstructions, and in and out of the crevices of its strong bed, to the majestic river, silently and steadily flowing on toward the sea, the water courses of the world are sources of pleasure and profit. They drain the country of superfluous humidity. They furnish power to move the wheels of our mills and manufacturing. They carry our commerce quickly and cheaply from state to state, and, in connection with our lakes and oceans, they provide us with an abundance of nutritious and wholesome food. Their presence greatly diversifies our landscapes, gives a pleasing variety to the scenes upon which the eye is accustomed to rest, and is the occasion of constant delight

“ To him who, in the love of nature, holds
Communion with her visible forms.”

In the sea we have water in almost limitless expanse and fathomless depth. It lies glistening under the sunlight, in seasons of calm weather, a mirror of the sky and the clouds, and an emblem of eternity. It connects hemispheres and continents. It is a highway for trade. Cities and nations flourish on its shores, and meet upon its bosom for battle or for commerce. When lashed to fury by hurrying gales, its waves rise like mountains, destroy the oak-ribbed ships constructed to out-ride its storms, and present to the eye scenes of the utmost grandeur and sublimity.

Springs, brooks, rivers, lakes and seas cover three-fourths of the area of the earth, are essential to its existence, and play an

important part in constituting it a fit dwelling-place for man, and an adequate theatre for his activities. Without the presence of water, man's life, if rendered possible at all, would be a walking through dry places indeed. Its creation is a striking instance of the wisdom of the Divine Mind, and of the directness with which the Creator often reaches His object. The regulation of its presence, in different parts of the earth, furnishes a constant opportunity for the display of the goodness of Providence.

Being present in such quantities, entering so largely as a feature into the form and appearance of the earth, serving such an important and useful purpose in satisfying our thirst, in our ablutions, in the preparation of our food and in our industries; it is not at all strange that water should be frequently mentioned in the word of God, that it should figure largely in sacred history, and that it should occupy a prominent place in the economy of salvation.

In the brief narrative of the creation, found in the book of Genesis, water holds a chief place. After the appearance of light, we are told that God said, "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so." And a little further on, God said, "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so. And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he Seas."

Nor is water absent from Moses' simple and graphic picture of Paradise. "And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became four heads. The name of the first is Pishon: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is that which compasseth the whole land of Cush. And the name of

the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth in front of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates."

Water was used by the Almighty as the first great instrument of the world's punishment, when the appalling catastrophe of the flood overwhelmed the race, in the days of Noah. The people of that age, with the exception of one family, had fallen into the grossest immorality. They had forgotten God and disregarded their obligations to Him. "And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth," and He determined to destroy him. This destruction was accomplished by covering the whole face of the earth with a great sheet of water, extending above even the tops of the highest mountains; so that "every living thing perished which was upon the surface of the ground, both man and cattle, and creeping thing, and fowl of the heaven." All were blotted out of existence, by means of the flood of waters, and on account of their sins, except those which were preserved alive in the ark.

The next striking mention of water is at the beginning of the remarkable history of the Israelitish nation. Their long years of exile and bondage had come to an end. A reluctant permission to let the people depart had been wrung from the Egyptian king, and the immense multitude of the descendants of Jacob, a nation on the march with wives and children and cattle, was on its way to the desert. The king had soon repented that he had allowed the people to go, and hastily summoning his guard, started in rapid pursuit of the fugitives. Suddenly, an apparently insurpassable barrier appeared before the Israelites. They had come to the Red Sea. Terrified and disheartened, they cried to the Lord; and he proved himself a sure refuge from their trouble. The waters of the sea were divided, "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea on dry land, and the waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left," so that they were enabled to cross in safety. Their enemies attempting the passage, the waters again came together and they were utterly destroyed. It was a most astonishing, unexpected and opportune miracle. It illus-

trated the power of God as nothing else could have done at the time. It impressed the people with an abiding sense of His goodness. It was an interposition of Providence, so wonderful and of such benefit, that it did not cease to be appealed to by poet and prophet down to the latest ages of Jewish history. Their God henceforth was the God who had divided the waters, who had brought them up out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

The Red Sea, and its remarkable passage, marked an epoch in Israel's national history. It was their first great triumph. It brought them self-consciousness and self-respect. It was their final deliverance from a state of servitude. Henceforth they were no longer a dependent, but a free people. It bounded on the one side, as the passage of the Jordan did on the other, that wonderful educational period of forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, when God guided them by a supernatural pillar of cloud and fire, when He fed them with bread from heaven and gave them water out of the rock to drink, when their garments waxed not old and their shoes did not wear out.

There were few places, between Egypt and Palestine, where a supply of water sufficiently large for such a multitude could be obtained. It was but a very short time therefore, after the people had left the shores of the Red Sea, before they found themselves and their cattle on the brink of perishing for want of water. In this emergency Moses was commanded to smite the rock of Horeb, and, when he did so, an abundant supply of water gushed out, and the thirst of the whole vast assembly was allayed. Thus they lacked neither bread to eat, nor water to drink, during all the years of their wandering in the desert. He, under whose direction they had begun their journey, showed Himself able to meet all their wants, while they were undergoing the discipline necessary to fit them to fulfill their high mission as the chosen nation after they had taken possession of the land of promise.

When we examine the Mosaic ceremonial system of approach to God and divine worship, we discover that much use is made

therein of the element of water. In the sacred tabernacle in the wilderness there was a large brazen laver, placed between the entrance and the altar, which contained water for the ablutions of the priests. Its place was taken in Solomon's temple by what was called a molten sea. "Also he made the molten sea, of ten cubits from brim to brim, round in compass, and the height thereof was five cubits; and a line of thirty cubits compassed it round about." "It stood upon twelve oxen, three looking toward the north, and three looking toward the west, and three looking toward the south, and three looking toward the east: and the sea was set upon them above, and all their hinder parts were inward. And it was an hand-breadth thick; and the brim thereof was wrought like the brim of a cup, like the flower of a lily: it received and held three thousand baths" (nearly seven hundred barrels). "He made also ten lavers, and put five on the right hand, and five on the left, to wash in them; such things as belonged to the burnt offering they washed in them: but the sea was for the priests to wash in." With water from the brazen laver in the tabernacle, or, afterwards, from the molten sea in the temple the priests were commanded to wash their hands and their feet. "They shall wash with water that they die not," was the command of God. Before entering upon his sacred office the levite and the priest were carefully washed in water, their garments also being pure and clean, and were sprinkled with the water of purifying, as features of the ceremony in which they were consecrated to the special service of the Most High. A thorough washing of body and garments was also enjoined before they began the offering of any particular sacrifice. Nothing that was in any way soiled could be used in the temple service. In certain cases it was commanded that the vessels should be "scoured and rinsed in water."

There was also on the part of the people such a thing as ceremonial uncleanness, which is described at length in the Mosaic law. He who touched a dead body or a bone of a dead person, or a sepulchre, or a person already unclean, or an unclean

animal, or who carried the dead body of an unclean animal, or who came into a tent in which a person had died, was ceremonially unclean. This condition debarred him from approaching the tabernacle, or taking any part in a religious service, even from intercourse with his fellow-men, inasmuch as whoever came in contact with him, became by that act himself unclean. To remove this uncleanness it was sufficient in some cases to wash the body and clothing and then at the close of the day the person would again be clean. In other cases the impurity remained for a week; but the body and clothing would have to be carefully washed and the person himself sprinkled on the third and on the seventh day with the water of separation. This water of separation was pure fresh water in which was mingled the ashes of a red heifer, burnt with cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet wool with special ceremonies. The priest who superintended the burning of the heifer, the man who did the burning, and the man who gathered up the ashes, all became unclean; and they were directed to wash their clothing and their bodies, that they might again become clean at the close of the day. Those who neglected this purifying of themselves were to be "cut off from the midst of the assembly," they were to lose their rights and privileges in the Jewish Church.

These must certainly be regarded as striking examples of the way in which water was employed in the history of God's ancient people. The flood, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the fact that God gave the people water out of a rock to drink during their sojourn in the desert, are in the first place great historical events, and have a place in the history of the race and of the Jewish nation just as other great events have. But they have also a symbolical character, and were designed to emphasize important truths. The flood taught the race the extreme abhorrence in which sin is held by the Divine Mind, the fact that its end is to be destroyed, together with the life which it has come thoroughly to pervade; and also the blessing of God upon a new life arising in a sense out of the old and separating itself from it, as illustrated in the salvation of Noah

and his family in the ark. This same truth, as St. Peter teaches us, underlies the rite of baptism; "which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism." In the crossing of the Red Sea, the Israelites severed for all time to come, their connection with that part of their history which had been passed in bondage, and entered upon a new stage of life, and, under a new leader, into a new and more intimate relation to Jehovah, accepting, in that act, His offer to be their God, and giving themselves up to His guidance and control as His people. This is also a symbol of the truth taught in baptism. In that transaction the sinner renounces the bondage of his former state, and, under the leadership of Christ, devotes himself to the service of God, comes into a new and peculiar relation to Him and enters upon that journey which will bring him, if faithfully persevered in, to the promised land on high. St. Paul no doubt had this correspondence in his mind when he said, speaking of the children of Israel, "they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." "In either case," says Dr. F. Gardiner, "there is a complete surrender of the individual's life and safety into the hands of his divinely appointed leader and a giving of allegiance to Him in the very act of accepting the salvation He offers." With reference to the manna, with which, along with the miraculous water out of the rock, the people were supported in the desert, we have this declaration from the lips of Moses himself: "And he humbled thee and suffered thee to hunger and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee to know that man doth not live by bread only, but by everything that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." The higher, heavenly life of man can not be sustained by earthly food, but is dependent upon the personal word of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and upon God's revealed truth for its beginning, continuance and growth. "For they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ." The clean and white raiment of the priests, the thorough cleansing of their bodies and clothing in their conse-

cration, and the bathing of their hands and feet before they were permitted to approach the sacred altar, the ceremonial uncleanness of the people, and the ablutions and sprinklings with the water of separation, which were enjoined upon them and through which this uncleanness was removed, were all in like manner highly significant. They were symbolical and perhaps to an extent also sacramental. In these solemn transactions the truth was set forth that man is, by reason of sin, corrupt and polluted in the sight of God, that the soul needs to be delivered from the deep-rooted power of sin, to be washed from its dark-colored stain, to be sanctified and so to be fitted for the inheritance of the saints in light; and that forgiveness and pardon were provided in God's merciful and gracious dispensation, in the blessings of which the Old Testament saints, through a faithful use of these ceremonies in which they had access to Jehovah, were permitted to share.

Teaching such important truths, these uses of water necessarily pointed the minds of men to the spiritual salvation which God was ready to bestow upon them. For in the Old Testament, as in the New, the sinner was invited to the mercy-seat of a gracious Father for spiritual refreshing and for deliverance from guilt and the future consequence of his transgressions; according to the words of Isaiah, "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God and he will abundantly pardon." And inasmuch as this cleansing from the guilt and power of sin and the gift of a new spiritual life were to be fully realized in the end only through the promised Messiah and His atoning sacrifice upon the cross, these uses of water were also typical of Christ, of Him "who came by water and blood," and of the fact that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.

Thus the minds and hearts of the Israelites were prepared, unconsciously no doubt, to a large extent, but also here and there consciously, for the advent of the Son of God in the character which it was necessary for Him to assume, and to

understand in a measure the particular work which He came into the world to perform. This view is clearly borne out by many passages in the Psalms and in the prophecies in which the thought of water is introduced; some of which contain pointed references to the work of Christ as one who is to heal and purify the souls which had become sick and polluted through sin. "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." "He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul." "For with thee is the fountain of life." "Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy wine and milk without money and without price." "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow." "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well." "Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the glowing sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty ground springs of water." "They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun smite them: for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them." "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness."

In full accordance with these Old Testament symbols and types, and these expressions of longing and hope for God in Christ, under the figure of a fountain or stream, to refresh and purify, the Lord Jesus Himself entered upon His official work, as did the priests in the Mosaic dispensation, through an ablution, the baptism by John in the river Jordan. "And Aaron and his sons," was the direction given to Moses, "thou shalt bring unto the door of the tent of meeting, and shalt wash them with water." So Christ was washed with water, at the thresh-

old of His public ministry, by him who was sent to prepare His way. "Can we question," asks Geikie, "that such an act was a crisis in the life of Our Lord? His perfect manhood, like that of other men, in all things, except sin, forbids our doubting it. Holy and pure before sinking under the waters, He must yet have risen from them with the light of a higher glory in His countenance. His past life was closed; a new era had opened. Hitherto the humble villager, veiled from the world, He was henceforth the Messiah, openly working amongst men. It was the true moment of His entrance on a new life. Past years had been buried in the waters of Jordan. He entered them as Jesus, the Son of Man; He rose from them, the Christ of God." "The sons of Aaron were required by the Levitical Law to be set apart to their high office by washing and anointing, and He who was to be clothed with an infinitely loftier priesthood, could not be allowed to want a correspondingly grander inauguration. Instead of the temple made with hands, He had around Him the great temple of nature; for the brazen laver He had the flowing river, reflecting the vault of heaven. If He had no golden robes, He had the robe of a sinless righteousness, and if there were no sacred oil, He had instead the anointing of the Holy Ghost."—(DR. C. GEIKIE.)

Christ's first disclosure of Himself as the Messiah was to a Samaritan woman, as He sat wearied and thirsty by the well of Jacob; and He presented Himself on this occasion as the giver of the water of life. The woman had come to the well for a pitcher of water. The Saviour asked for a drink. She expressed surprise that a Jew should ask drink of a Samaritan. He answered, "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, give me to drink; thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water." "Every one that drinketh of this water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life." And when at the close of the conversation, the woman said, "I know that Messiah

cometh (which is called Christ): when he is come, he will declare unto us all things. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he." And the result was that this woman and many of the people of her city, by reason of her testimony, and others, because they had seen and heard Him themselves, became believers on Him as the Saviour of the world. Christ here presented "objective salvation in a sensible emblem," as the water of life. He is symbolized by the patriarchal well-diggers, especially by Jacob. Jacob gave his children that well to allay natural thirst. Jesus, a greater than Jacob, as he was a greater than Solomon, gives those who believe on Him the water which allays all thirst, the peace of God which passeth understanding. "By the water of life," says Olshausen, "Jesus evidently does not intend His doctrine, or, to speak generally, anything abstract, communicable in ideas, but the element of His life itself. As He says: I am the light of the world and I am the bread of life, so also He Himself is the water of life, in which He gives His life to the world. Hence the point of comparison is this, as the *Light* enlightens and imparts the knowledge of reality, so the *Water* invigorates, quickens, quenches thirst, and satisfies desire. Moreover, the life of the Redeemer, as the eternal itself, allays all the craving of man's heart in his mortal state, a craving which can never be appeased by the creations of that which is transitory, except for a time, because, in its ultimate foundation, it constantly refers to that which is eternal—for ever and ever."

Nor was this the only time that Christ presented Himself under this figure. On a certain occasion at the feast of Tabernacles, the last of the three great feasts, celebrated from the fifteenth to the twenty-third of the month Tishri, the seventh month of the Jewish religious year, He proclaimed Himself as the water of life under the most impressive circumstances. The feast of Tabernacles commemorated the journey through the wilderness. During its continuance, the people dwelt in booths, constructed in the courts and upon the roofs of their houses and in the open places of the city. This was done in memory of the temporary habitations which they had occupied in the

desert. After the captivity the ceremony of drawing water was introduced as a feature of the celebration. At the close of each of the first seven days of the feast, a priest with a golden pitcher drew water from the well of Siloam on the temple hill and brought it to the altar, mixed with it a quantity of sacrificial wine, and poured it out into two perforated vessels. This is supposed to have had reference to several things: to the rain which during the season just past had made the earth fruitful, to the new doctrines of the coming Messiah, but especially was it thought to commemorate the miraculous springs with which the thirst of the people was allayed in their journey through the desert. This drawing and pouring out of water was accompanied with great demonstrations of joy. The trumpets sounded. Trained choirs sang the hallel. The people shook the branches of palm, willow and myrtle which they held in their hands; and a great religious dance was engaged in. The Jews had a saying that "he who never saw the rejoicing of the drawing of water never saw rejoicing in all his life." On the eighth day of the feast all the ceremonies of the other days were repeated except that of the drawing and pouring out of the water. Thus the end of the journey through the desert was commemorated. They had come "into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, springing forth in valleys and hills; a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig trees and pomegranates; a land of oil, olives and honey." The miraculous springs were now no longer needed. The water, left out of the ceremony for this reason on the eighth day, would be conspicuous by its absence. Men would say, Where is the water? Why is it not drawn as on other days? It was just at this point, as some suppose, that "Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink," thus inviting the multitude, who felt the absence of the refreshing element from the ceremony, to Himself as the true fountain of everlasting life.

In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus said: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall

be filled." Christ was fully aware of the awful sense of want in men's hearts. He knew that where that want was not felt, it was so because the heart had not yet been awakened. He was aware also that many mistake the true object of their deepest desires; that they spend money for that which is not bread, and their labor for that which satisfieth not. He knew that no earthly or temporal good, however great and valuable, could permanently satisfy the craving of the heart in its search after good; that only the highest and best could bring eternal rest and peace. He knew that He Himself, and the purity and moral perfection, the salvation and eternal life which He was able to bestow, were the true object of desire, and that only when the heart was fixed on these could there be any prospect of its complete satisfaction. And thus, speaking of desire, He pointed out its only proper object, as consisting in righteousness, and in Him who is "the Lord our righteousness." Here again, therefore, He is the bread and water of life to the hungry and thirsty soul. At another place Christ said: "He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." He that approaches me with a believing heart will find in Me alone "that truth which will satisfy his understanding, that atoning righteousness which will pacify his conscience, that sanctifying influence which will transform his character, that soul-satisfying portion which will fill his heart."

Before leaving the world, Christ had wrought out its salvation in His own person, character and work. His person was a new creation. In Him human nature was taken up into union with the divine nature, justified, sanctified and finally glorified at the right hand of God. This new creation was to be perpetuated and extended in the world. Those having died in Adam were to be made alive in Christ. They were not to be restored simply, however, to the full possession of all that was lost in their moral death, but they were to have more than Adam had, even before the fall. They were to be livingly, organically united to Christ, the second Adam, the Divine-

human Head of the new race. They were to become branches of Him who is the true vine, which His Father, the husbandman, had planted for this purpose.

The effecting of this relation between Christ and the believer is graphically described by the term "new birth," used by Christ Himself and also by His inspired followers. The Saviour said, in his conversation with Nicodemus: "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And further on He says: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." St. John says: "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become the children of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." St. Peter says: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his great mercy, begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." Again St. John says: "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not."

This regeneration is ascribed by St. Peter to the word of God, where he speaks of Christians as "having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God which liveth and abideth." So Christ Himself says at a certain place: "He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but is passed out of death into life."

At other places in the word of God the new relation is spoken of as dependent upon the Lord's Supper. Christ says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." In the institution of the Supper, as described by St. Matthew, the same thought appears: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup and gave thanks, and gave to them,

saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins." St. Paul also speaks of it as follows: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of" (or participation in, as in the margin) "the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of" (or participation in) "the body of Christ?"

The sacrament of Baptism is, however, looked upon on all sides, at least wherever the ordinances of Christ are regarded as channels of His saving grace, as the real beginning of the individual's new relation to God through Christ. From this as the starting-point, through growth in grace, it is possible for him to come to full Christian stature. The Saviour said to Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The great commission to the disciples was: "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

Two things stand out prominently in the Christianization of the individual member of a fallen race. The one is the destruction of sinfulness and the cleansing of the soul from its corruption and guilt; the other is the quickening of a new life in the heart and the transformation of the character into conformity with that of Christ. It is thus expressed in the word of God: first, "that ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man, which waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit;" secondly, "that ye be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, which after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth." And this is strikingly set forth in baptism. It is the office of water to destroy, as in the flood. In this sacrament we have a sign and seal of the destruction of the corrupt nature. It is the office of water to cleanse and purify, as we learn from one of its most common uses, the world over. It was thus employed

under the Old Covenant as a symbol of cleansing from ceremonial pollution. In the sacrament it is a sign and seal of the purification of the soul from sin; according to the language of Ananias to Saul: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." In like manner St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, after mentioning different classes of sinners, says: "And such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God." It is the office of water also to quicken and renew, to introduce fresh vigor and life, to be the means and the starting-point of a new growth. This is seen in the springing up of vegetation at the coming of rain after a severe drouth, in the invigoration of one who is faint and ready to perish with thirst when water is reached. In the sacrament we have the sign and seal of a spiritual renewing, of the introduction and implanting of the new life of the second Adam; according to the language of St. Paul: "According to his mercy he saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." These two sides, destruction and quickening, are brought out in several passages: "Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." And again: "In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Martensen says of baptism: "As a divine ceremony, it is the act by which Christ, our invisible High Priest and King, establishes His Church within the individual, and consecrates him in a true relation to God." "By baptism man is incorporated into

the new kingdom, and the possibility of, the necessary requirements for, the new personality are given therein."

The fact is not to be lost sight of, however, that the sacrament does not consist in the mere outward washing with water. Water alone is never spoken of, either in the Old or New Testament, as washing away sin or quickening to a new spiritual life. Water baptism cannot effect this. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as water baptism in the Christian dispensation. Where only water is present, it is a mere washing, and is not worthy the name of baptism. Christ speaks of being born of water and the Spirit, and St. Paul of the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Water is symbolical of the blood and Spirit of Christ; and the external sprinkling or washing with water is symbolical of the application to the soul of the benefits of the atoning death of Christ, and its cleansing from the pollution and guilt of sin by the operation of the Holy Spirit, as well as its quickening to a new life through the life and Spirit of Christ: according to His language to St. Peter: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me." Moreover, it has pleased God in the ordinance to join the symbol and that which is symbolized, and it is this fact that constitutes it a sacrament, through which He "declares and seals to us the promise of the gospel, viz., that He grants us fully the remission of sin and life eternal, for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross." Thus also "He assures us by this divine pledge and sign that we are spiritually cleansed from our sins as really as we are externally washed with water."

It may be truly said that, in its sacramental use, water reaches its highest glory. Its principal uses in the Old Testament seem to look forward to this. That element, so abundant, so widely distributed, so necessary to life and health, cleansing, purifying all that comes in contact with it, invigorating, quickening, bringing new life to plant and animal and man, also an agent of destruction under certain circumstances, becomes the divinely chosen symbol of man's justification, of

the destruction of his sinful nature, of the quickening of the new life of the Spirit in his soul, and of his sanctification to be a member of Christ. Even more than this: in His mercy and wisdom, God has sacramentally joined these two together, so that water and its work are the divine pledge and seal of the presence and sanctifying and renewing power and operation of Christ's atoning blood and of His quickening Spirit.

But one more use of water in the sacred Scriptures remains to be noticed. It is employed as an emblem of the happiness which shall be the portion of the redeemed in the world to come. As we have, in the beginning of the word of God, a picture of that paradise which was the habitation of the human family, in the innocence of its infancy, so we have, in the last of the sacred books, a picture of another, better paradise, which those who have been restored to righteousness and life shall inherit. When the veil of the future was lifted, and St. John was permitted to look upon the unimagined glory of the promised land above, he saw a great white throne, before which were four and twenty elders clothed in white raiment. Of Him whom John saw walking among the seven golden candlesticks, it was said: "And his head and his hair were white as white wool, white as snow." The Spirit said to the churches: "To him that overcometh will I give a white stone." Again: "He that overcometh shall thus be arrayed in white garments," and "they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy." John also saw "a great multitude which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands;" and it was said: "These are they which come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

Water for cleansing and purifying is no longer needed; but water for refreshing is a feature of the blessings of the New Jerusalem. Of the inhabitants of the city it is said: "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall

the sun strike upon them, nor any heat; for the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life; and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes." The Lord says: "I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely." A striking feature of the first paradise was a river; so in the second John says: "And he showed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb, in the midst of the street thereof. And on this side of the river and on that was the tree of life." And almost the last words of the sacred canon are a gracious invitation to this water of life: "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely."

V.

THE ORGANISM OF THE CHURCH YEAR.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D.

IN all lands and in all past ages, wherever religion has been reduced to a system at all, an ecclesiastical year, to a greater or less extent, has been developed. Among the heathen generally there has always been a dark faith or feeling that the objects in *space*, the domain of external nature, are in some way connected with supersensuous beings, and that portions at least of the flow of *time* should rightly be dedicated to the honor and service of the gods. Sacred days and seasons were set apart for religious purposes more systematically by the Romans, perhaps, than by any other nation of antiquity. Compared with other cultivated people, they were amongst the most religious and devout, especially during their earlier history. At Rome it was customary for the Pontifex Maximus, or high priest, to announce the religious festivals for each month in advance, so that the people might know the days on which they could attend to business, and those which had been set apart for a sacred purpose. The principal deities, therefore, in their pantheon—Saturn, Vulcan, Bacchus, Pan, Neptune, Jupiter, and others—had each a festival in his honor during the course of the year. The old Roman calendar, dividing the month into days, sacred and secular, *Dies fasti* and *Dies nefasti*, became subsequently the model after which the calendars of Christian nations were formed.

The effort of the heathen to unite the world of time and space with a spiritual world above it, was a failure, as in the nature of things it had to be. Their religious solemnities, very

properly, followed the order of the seasons. At the vernal equinox, when the bondage of winter gave way to the free life of spring and summer, to the period of flowers and fruit, they generally celebrated their kind of a passover; in September, the season of vintage, when the fruits of the year were all gathered in, they held their second passover with joy and rejoicing, but at the same time with some feeling of sadness, as the sun crossed the line and introduced them again to the reign of winter. They, however, watched the course of the sun-god, and at the winter solstice when he began again to turn the light of his countenance upon them, they were wont to break forth into uproarious rejoicings, and, laying aside all social distinctions, they celebrated their wild Saturnalia. But in all this striving to rise above the plane of nature, the heathen everywhere fell back again helpless into its dark embrace. The Sun and Moon, that ruled the days and nights, the months and the changing seasons of the year, as the servants of God, with other creatures in the natural world, as well as the creations of fancy, became the objects of a degrading homage. The worship of Apollo and Venus, the beautiful ideals which the Greeks had formed of manhood and womanhood, deteriorated into the lowest sensuality. Heathen worship in general, and heathen sacred festivals in particular, were prostituted to purposes so base, as to appear incredible; and so they would be to us, if the same facts were not reported to us by foreign missionaries of to-day. A military officer at Antioch, at the time of Christ, would not allow his Roman soldiers to attend the worship of Apollo in the Daphnean grove, where Grecian art and taste had combined in vain to render the worship pure and refined.

But, whilst the sacred year of the heathen was thus *polytheistic*, with its corresponding degradation, that of the Jews was strictly *monotheistic* and elevating. The latter takes its start in the Sabbath, a day of rest, one in seven, instituted to commemorate the work of creation in such a way as to render the honor and glory to the Creator, the one true and living God. This institution was established by the inspiration and appoint-

ment of Almighty God Himself. It falls in fully with the harmony and laws of nature, in the profoundest sense; but it is not at all probable that it would have been established and upheld from age to age without the force of a divine command. From week to week it reminded the Hebrew nation of the leading principle of their religion, and inculcated the duty of the people to worship one God, over against the almost irresistible influence of neighboring polytheistic nations.

The Sabbath, however, was also the germ or promise of other festivals, which were established by the same divine authority. It was a remembrancer of God and His works in general; but as the children of Israel passed out of the state of bondage or pupilage, and became a nation, events occurred in their history which, as they manifestly displayed the hand of God, were emphasized, and kept in remembrance by the appointment of memorial days. The Passover, therefore, was celebrated in the spring, when the children of Israel were miraculously delivered out of Egyptian bondage. In the fall, at the autumnal equinox, at the Feast of Tabernacles, they commemorated the forty years' sojourn of their forefathers in the wilderness. At the same time it was likewise a festival of thanksgiving for the produce of the year, which had now all been gathered from the fields. It was properly preceded by the great Day of Atonement, which was kept as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer, on which the people were expected to grieve over their sins, and to look to God for the removal of their guilt in a general atoning sacrifice. It was the proper preparation for the festival of rejoicing that followed. Both occasions were in harmony with the seasons, the one apparently rejoicing in the beneficent reign of the sun, the other grieving at his departure. The third great festival, Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, was observed at the end of the wheat and barley harvests, which were the most important crops, and seemed to call for some celebration at this time as the harvest of the first fruits, in distinction from that of the ingathering in the fall. It carried with it also a reference to the giving of the law on

Mount Sinai, which took place fifty days after the Passover. In addition to these three great festivals, the Feast of the Trumpets, of divine appointment also, was celebrated with appropriate religious rites at the appearance of every new moon. Thus the *month* as well as the *year* was sanctified in the mind of the pious Jew. Several other festivals, of human origin, but of national significance, were also observed. Purim, Queen Esther's festival, a Jewish holiday, occurred several weeks before Easter, and was a kind of carnival that preceded the purification and preparation for a proper observance of the Passover. The Feast of Dedication was celebrated on the 25th of December, at the time of the winter solstice. It was the Feast of Lights, in honor of the purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabæus, celebrated at Jerusalem and in Jewish families generally throughout the world. It has its importance to us, because it was the precursor of our Christmas.

The Jewish sacred year was thus strictly *monotheistic*; it synchronized with the natural year, it is true, quite as much so as that of the heathen, showing that nature had its rights in the service of God, and that its true mission was to unite with man in celebrating His praises. But the mind of the Jew in his holy days was continually raised above the blind forces of nature, to contemplate the great Creator of all things, and to adore Him for His wonderful works. Communion between Him and the Gentile was, therefore, as impossible as communion between light and darkness. Their mutual aversion and contempt for each other followed as a natural consequence. Salvation was of the Jews, and his feasts looked beyond nature, and in their order served as the natural basis on which the more spiritual festivals of the new dispensation were to be established. The Church Year of Christianity, on the other hand, in the course of its development, became *tritheistic* in a trinitarian sense. It remained eminently *monotheistic* still, because it retained the *Sabbath* as its starting-point, but it gave it a new character so as to include the commemoration of the

higher fact of redemption in connection with that of creation. Weekly it emphasizes the first article of the creed :

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.

But all other festivals have reference to the revelation of God as Father, Son or Holy Ghost. They assumed this character, not by setting aside the old festivals, but, as in the case of the Sabbath or Lord's Day, by giving them Christian contents and meaning. Easter no longer referred to a temporal deliverance, but to redemption and salvation; Pentecost, no longer to the first fruits of all, but to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the first fruit of the new dispensation; and the Feast of Dedication, no longer to the old temple, but to the Incarnation, out of which the new temple was to arise, in which all lands and nations were to congregate and worship.

Naturally, Easter became the first and most prominent Christian festival, because it celebrated the new fact of redemption. It came home primarily to men anxious to escape from the bondage of sin and to flee from the wrath to come. It was, no doubt, observed in the Christian sense from the time of the Apostles. But as the Church increased it was natural that the Christian consciousness should revert to the Incarnation, as the centre and origin of all that Christ was and did for the world. His miraculous birth was involved at first in His Epiphany or Manifestation to the world in connection with other facts in His life, such as His baptism, and was commemorated at an early day in many places in the East on the 6th of January. But the Epiphany festival among the idealistic Greeks naturally laid stress, more and more, on the divinity or theophany of Christ, and it became necessary in some way to correct this one-sidedness. This was brought about in the course of time, in the realistic Church of the West, by the development of Christmas, out of an old Jewish festival. This, better than the Epiphany, intoned the humanity of Christ, and brought it into proper relations to His divinity.

St. Chrysostom, in the year 386, says that in his day

Christmas was coming to be generally celebrated in all the churches, having spread from the West to the East. Connecting it most intimately, in his own mind, with the Incarnation, God manifest in the flesh, he gives it the preference over all others, because "they depended on the Incarnation, and the transaction of this day was, of all others, the most stupendous." (Coleman's "Christian Antiquities," p. 436). With him it was "the most venerable, the metropolis, and mother of all festivals."

Although not generally observed in the Church, until the Eastern and Western Churches cordially united in celebrating it on the 25th of December, in the fourth century, it was no doubt kept in particular Churches from an early period. Chrysostom says that this was the case in the Church at Rome. It is quite reasonable to suppose that this was literally true of the Christians at Rome. They were at first mostly Jews, and they were accustomed to observe the Feast of Dedication, the Feast of Lights, on the 25th of December, from their childhood with the rest of Jews throughout the world, but in passing over to the Christian Church, they would continue to celebrate their old festival by giving it a higher, Christian character. This was done, most likely in their families at first, and then in their congregations, until it extended over the Church, in the fourth century, from Spain to Thrace, as it was said, and not long afterwards, over the entire Church, East and West. This we conceive to be the true genesis of our Christmas, which leaves no ground for the supposition that it is simply the old Roman Saturnalia, reformed and clothed with a Christian name and signification. The German word for Christmas—*Weinacht*, or Dedication Night—is a very ancient one, coming down from the fourth or fifth century, and shows that among the early Gothic Christians it still retained its original feature of a dedication feast. It was no longer the memorial of the purification or re-dedication of the old temple at Jerusalem, which had passed away, but of the temple of humanity which Christ came to restore to its original sacred purpose. In support of this

view of Christmas we refer our readers to the article on "Weinacht," in Herzog's Encyclopedia, by Paulus Cassel, and to his book on "Christag," upon which his article is based. They are exhaustive, and, as it seems to us, set aside the old mechanical view of Christmas, as a politic off-set to a disgraceful heathen carnival, and go to show that "it grewed" naturally out of the Christian consciousness as this grew out of faith in Christ as the real and true God-man.

Thus Epiphany and Christmas became distinct celebrations; but they formed, in fact, only one festival. The rejoicing of Christmas was kept up until Epiphany, and then continued during the Epiphany period until Lent, when it met the shadow which Good Friday cast backwards over the public manifestation of Christ in the flesh to the world at large. Both were Theophanies; at times the one was called *Prima Nativitas*, and the other *Secunda Nativitas*. Thus the first Christmas festival had a two-fold character; and, as we shall see hereafter, the same is true of the two other great festivals, that logically and organically, in fact, grew out of it.

No leading Christian festival, for obvious reasons, could be developed out of the old Feast of Tabernacles; at least, no one took its place; and its chief interest in the mind of the pious Jewish Christians concentrated itself in the festival of Christ's Nativity. The natural element of light entered into both as a symbol or prophecy, and found its true fulfillment in Christ, who is the light of the world.

Christmas is to be regarded as the real beginning of the Christian year—its *Fons et Origo*,—as it seems to us. The preceding period of Advent was always regarded as a season of preparation, more or less of fasting and prayer in the churches, whereby believers were purified and elevated in mind, so that they might be properly prepared to celebrate the approaching feast with joy and rejoicing, with profit and edification. It was a period of twilight, during which pious souls, in a state of expectancy, waited for the rising sun of a happy Christmas and a bright Epiphany. It is an illustration of a commendable

custom, prevalent alike among Gentiles as well as Jews, to anticipate their periods of feasting by periods of fasting. The two went together, and manifestly grew out of the natural piety of men in the Oriental world.

The period of Advent, however, looks forward not only to the coming of Christ in the flesh in its lessons, but also to His second coming in glory at the end of the world. It is a season, consequently, when Christians are called on to consider the Judgment Day and to seek to prepare themselves for it as an awful reality; but, at the same time, as the great Christmas Day that will have no end. More properly speaking, therefore, Advent ought to be regarded as the end of the Church-Year, so arranged, however, in a cycle that the last link meets and connects itself organically with the first.

Advent answers to the last article in the Creed, referring to God, the Son, where it is said that "He shall come again from heaven to judge the quick and the dead," and to the last article included in our faith in the Holy Ghost, where we are required to believe in the life eternal, whereas Christmas and Epiphany refer to those that follow the first or most general article in the Creed, as follows:

*I believe in Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, our Lord,
Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,
Born of the Virgin Mary.*

Easter, as the outcome of Christmas, was the first great festival that was developed in the history of the Church, not so much because of its centrality in the church year, as for the fact that it commemorated the great work of Christ—something that was best calculated to arrest the attention of men first. It was just what they wished to hear. This is the order in all true organic developments. Thus it was in the natural creation. Historically, or in the order of time, the outward universe appeared first, and then afterwards its underlying idea in the appearance of man on the scene,—Easter was connected with Good Friday, and like Epiphany was two-fold. Together

they formed one and the same commemoration. Good Friday represented the chaos preceding the new world that was to be; Easter, that new creation already virtually completed in its grandeur and glory in the person of Christ. It was the Sabbath in which Christ, the author of the new creation, rested from His labors. The natural world, in its beauty and harmony, continued to be substantially what it was as it came from the hand of the Creator; the world of man had gone back into chaos once more; but now, on the first Easter morn at Jerusalem, when Christ rose from the dead, its primitive order was restored by its new Head and Representative. The day that celebrated this wonder of wonders became, therefore, more and more truly a holy day to all devout worshippers. Salvation and redemption were of more account to men than the present world, with its cattle on its thousand hills or its ten thousand rivers of oil. Easter taught the Church to look back into the dark past, to be glad in the bright present, and to rejoice in the still brighter future which loomed up to view in the restitution of all things, in a world ransomed, renewed, beautified and glorified.

Easter, however, like Christmas, in order that it might prove to be the source of the greatest blessing to the Church, was, at an early period, preceded by vigils, fastings, prayers and good works. The pious Jew felt the necessity of some preparation of this kind to a profitable celebration of his Passover, and came up to Jerusalem some weeks before the time to purify himself for it; or he sought to do the same thing at home in his own family. This feeling, common to all Oriental religions, passed over into the Christian Church and gave rise to the Lenten Fast. Its duration varied at different periods. At first it continued only forty hours, embracing the time that elapsed from the Saviour's death to his resurrection; but afterwards it was prolonged to forty days, so as to correspond with the time of His fasting in the wilderness. The forty days, however, did not include the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths during Lent, which still retained their festal character, throw-

ing light over the gloom and sadness of the Church. As Passion Week—saddest week of all—approached, they assumed more and more their joyful nature, until Palm Sunday, when the Church put on its festive robes, and with every indication of joy celebrated the triumph of her Lord and King over all His enemies. As the triumphant entry of Christ into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday shed light upon the dark vale of His sufferings in Gethsemane and on the cross, and thus armed Him for the horrors that awaited Him at Jerusalem, so in after ages the same day has, through the centuries, prepared the minds of the faithful for a profitable contemplation of the sufferings of Christ on the accursed tree.

The season of Lent thus grew out of Good Friday, or rather, as we may say, belongs to that cycle of holy days which culminated in Easter. But are we to suppose that it had no connection with the season of joy that preceded it during the Epiphany period? We say, by no means. That period includes the Manifestation of Christ from His birth, in His works and words, until He came up to Jerusalem to die, of which His baptism, and His first miracle at Cana, were simply exemplifications or prephesies. Such an Epiphany could not be without its legitimate effect upon all right-minded men. When Peter witnessed the miraculous draught of fish on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, he saw clearly the divine character of Christ, and as a consequence of this revelation, he fell down at His feet in deep self-debasement, and acknowledged himself to be a sinful man. In like manner the objective representation of Christ as He lived, labored and spoke whilst on earth, must ever be attended by an experience in the heart of men similar to that of Peter the disciple. Epiphany, therefore, prepared the way for Lent, by the power of a concrete logic, underlies it in fact, and serves to give it life and vitality. The Christmas cycle, in other words, meets the Easter cycle of solemnities, as it were, half-way, in mid-winter, and completes the organism of the Church year up to the great festival of the Resurrection.

After the fasting and humiliation of Lent had ended in the

rejoicings of Easter morning, a period of continuous festivity commenced which lasted for fifty days. It was the Feast of Pentecost, or of Weeks, seven in all. At Easter many catechumens had been received into the church, backsliders had been reclaimed, and the first fruits of the spiritual year had been presented to the Lord. Religious services, including the frequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper, were observed, and a universal feeling of thanksgiving and rejoicing everywhere pervaded the Christian communities, during which time the poor were clothed and fed.

At the end of forty days the Church had commemorated and intoned four more articles of the Apostles' Creed, beginning where the Epiphany cycle had left off, as follows:

He suffered under Pontius Pilate,

Was crucified, dead and buried;

He descended into Hades;

The third day He arose from the dead.

During the forty days that Christ remained on earth the disciples honored the Son as they honored the Father. So far as their own experience was concerned, they knew of only two persons in the Godhead; and they were required to wait until the Comforter should come, who was to complete historically the revelation of God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. That took place when the day of Pentecost, the great Sabbath of the Pentecostal period, was fully come.

The outpouring of the Holy Ghost, however, on this occasion, was celebrated with the ascension of Christ. They, too, also form one and the same general fact, because, as we are told, the Comforter could not come until Christ was glorified—of course, in His divine human nature. Thus the Feast of Pentecost, like Christmas and Easter, was also duplex, and made up of two chief days, but forming only one festival; or rather, another cycle of festivals connecting itself with those that preceded it.

With the gift of the Spirit, the revelation of the outward, historical, objective facts of redemption came to its proper end and consummation. There was nothing more to reveal, at least

nothing further was needed for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. The time had, therefore, arrived when the outward revelation of God in history should become inward and subjective by the appropriation of its blessings to the hearts and experiences of men. This was to be accomplished by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Church, and by His permanent abode in the hearts of believers. The period, therefore, from Pentecost to the end of the church-year, or to Advent, was made to refer more particularly to the work of the Spirit, to the conversion of sinners, to the establishment of the Christian Church, to the work of the ministry, to the power of the keys, to the sacraments, to the spread of the gospel at home and abroad in other lands by home and foreign missions, and to the victories of Christ over all his enemies down to the end of time, when He shall appear in glory surrounded with the saints and His holy angels. This was the meaning of its lessons, sermons and meditations. The Holy Spirit, however, was not to be regarded, in any sense, as standing by Himself, sundered from His connections, and operating upon the world in an isolated and abstract manner. In Him, the revelation of God to man as Father, Son and Holy Ghost, was completed; the period that followed became the Trinity Period; and the Sundays were all Trinity Sundays until Advent.

The Trinity—a stupendous mystery—is to be regarded not simply as a doctrine, but as a fact, in which each person in the Godhead has His sphere of activity, but always in unison with the other two. Through the light and illuminating power of the Spirit, the believer sees and feels the love of the Father, and is enabled to embrace the grace of the Son, which involves deliverance from the guilt of sin, and his regeneration or restoration to a new and heavenly life. All this is secured by our communion with the Holy Ghost. An abstract trinity is a “terror to the mind” and a stumbling-block to thought; a concrete trinity, on the other hand, is “a thing of beauty,” or as we may say, a perpetual feast to the heart and mind. For how can men resist its constraining power when it opens the very

heavens to their view, pouring out blessings upon them, proclaiming a ransom to the prisoner, eyesight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, freedom to the captive, the bread of life to the hungry, and the water of life to the thirsty. It is, moreover, the only effectual barrier against pernicious errors of the intellect, such as Atheism, Pantheism, Deism, and all other rationalistic isms. It addresses the spiritual nature of man no less than his intellect, his heart no less than his head, and receives a response from both. It may be said to meet a want in thinking minds, without which they go astray into a wilderness of errors from pantheism down to fetichism itself.

The Trinity Period is in an eminent degree useful for purposes of edification, and it should be most potent in promoting growth in grace among Christians. It embodies in it the meaning and power, the substance and reality, of all the other festivals preceding. In all there are six of them. Christmas and Epiphany, Easter and Good Friday, Ascension Day and Pentecost, but Trinity Sunday is the seventh, the beginning of the end, and may be regarded as the Sabbatical festival, in which through the Trinity Sundays the Church rests, by resting in the bosom of the ever adorable Trinity—the One in Three and the Three in One. This period gathers up all the separate truths announced in the other grand Epochs, and presents them to us in one panoramic view of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in which the antitheses of the three persons—to carnal minds so many contradictions—are brought together in one general, all-embracing synthesis or union. With this revelation of heavenly truth during the summer and autumn, the period of fruit and ingathering, with its blue skies and whispering breezes, and its wealth of life unfolded in every avenue that opens up to view around us, calling for something to correspond to it in the spiritual order, the Christian's faith ought to come to its highest symmetrical development, in a spiritual autumn. Struggling upwards from the incarnation, and rising from one elevation of view to another, it sees in the distance the mountain of God's holiness; and whilst, when true to itself, it is supremely

active, it gains a Sabbath of rest, and from its commanding position it surveys the past with tearless eye, and the future with a bounding heart and a cheerful hope.

Such a view of the triune God is all-important to a sound and living faith. Without such support in the objective order of things, it must be more or less imperfect and one-sided, if it does not run into serious error. We may become only practical Monotheists, or practically worship one out of the three and not the rest. With persons of a filial disposition, with cultured minds, the love of the Father may become so prominent and engrossing as to ignore the other equal persons of the Godhead: to profound thinkers Christ may become so much, all in all, in a mechanical and one-sided Christology, as to leave no room for the Father; and so there are others who lay so much stress on the Spirit as the chief thing, that they, in effect, dispense with the Father and the Son, in their efforts to live and walk in the Spirit. In our day, when so many abstractions—the idols of men's own minds—are set up for worship, it is important that each person in the "Sacred Three," should stand out distinctly to faith, but still more, in their union in the Trinity. This is what the Church tries to do for us during the Trinity Period.

As summer and autumn pass over into the reign of winter, so the Trinity Period, with the gifts of Providence and Grace, passes over naturally into the season of Advent. As the fruitage of summer is succeeded by winter, so the Christian life, with its toils and victories, is followed by death, the resurrection, the judgment day, the future reign of the saints in glory. Festivity, gladness and joy give place to watching and prayer, fastings, self-denials, and to works of charity, to self-humiliation and preparation for the coming of Christ. But then as the end of Christ's mediatorial reign looms up to view, the mind of the Christian logically reverts to its humble beginning at Bethlehem; and, as December's chilly blasts gather round us, we think of a bright Christmas and the mystery of the Incarnation. Both Christmas and the Trinity Period call for this intervening period of Advent. The logic of the Church Year calls for it;

it is, as we might say, the last link that unites the end with the beginning of the year, in one unbroken cycle.

With the close of Advent, the Creed also comes to an end. All its sublime truths have been announced to the world, in harmony with the seasons as they came and went. From Ascension Day and Whitsuntide to Christmas, during the latter half of the year, the remaining articles of the Creed have been proclaimed by the Church during the gloom of winter, the sunlight of spring and the whispering breezes of summer and autumn, as follows:

He ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Remission of Sins, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting. Amen.

To these primary festivals, however, many others were added in the progress of time, by the authorities of the Church, in honor of the saints, which were supposed to be salutary in promoting the piety of the simple-minded people. They increased so rapidly in number that every day in the year, except Sunday was dedicated to some particular saint, and when the calendar failed to supply all the more distinguished ones with a memorial day, one was set apart for "All Saints," so that no one might be omitted, and one also even for "All Souls." They took their rise in early times in the annual commemorations around the graves of the first martyrs, on the day of their martyrdom. The services on these occasions were solemn and impressive, in perfect harmony with the Christian standpoint, consisting of singing and prayers, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and a recital of the acts and words of the martyrs in their last sufferings. Thus their deaths were observed as their birth-days, in the Kingdom of glory. In the course of time, however, such simple and devout services came to be perverted, and were succeeded by formal orations, panegyrics, canonizations and many excesses of a more or less idolatrous nature, such as saint-worship, mariolatry, and a superstitious reverence for relics.

Were these saints' days the legitimate growth of the Church Year? We think not. When they came to change their original character, they became adventitious growths that were not without some good fruit in the peculiar state of society and the Church, but destined in the end to be taken away from the vine as so many barren or dead branches. It is a remarkable fact that the festivals of the ancient Jews commemorated simply the mighty acts of God to the children of Israel in their history as the chosen people of God. None of them were dedicated to the memory of individual men, however much distinguished they may have been in their day. Neither Moses, Samuel, David nor Daniel was honored in this way. The entire trend of the Jewish faith was antagonistic to festivals in honor of mere men. The Christian Church, as based on the Jewish, must, therefore, have suffered more or less violence by the introduction of so many days that celebrated the praises of men rather than of God, from whom all good things—saints as well as their heroic lives—proceed. Accordingly we must trace the development of these days, to a certain extent, to a pagan element that gradually insinuated itself into the cultus of the Church, which in the end operated with pernicious effects. Greece and Rome, just like the other heathen nations, were addicted to hero-worship, and, as a consequence, appointed days on which they paid divine homage to their memories. The greatest among them were apotheosized, translated to the stars and worshipped as demi-gods. The existing Church, surrounded with such an atmosphere as this, and receiving into its communion many who were no better than baptized heathen, took up into its body a considerable amount of heathen leaven, which showed itself by its fruits. Parasitic plants fastened themselves upon her, fed and flourished on her sap and vitality. The homage offered to the saints and their relics, together with the worship of the Virgin Mary, was, therefore, a development or growth that did not proceed legitimately from Judaism nor from Christianity, but from paganism itself rather. It identified itself with the pious reverence of the early Christians for the memory of the

martyrs, and finding in it a suitable nidus, continued to propagate its poisonous species from century to century.

Christianity, however, differs from all other religions in the fact that it never grows old or decrepid, that it cannot be crushed by the weight of dead tradition, and that its vitality cannot be drawn out of it by parasitic plants that fasten themselves upon it and for a while destroy its normal activity. It possesses a hidden life in Christ, its head, an irresistible recuperative energy, when the incubus on its freedom of action becomes the heaviest. When abuses and errors prove to be a dead weight on its life, it reacts and throws them off by an innate energy of its own, and sometimes with a volcanic power. The vessel of the Church thus appears at times as if submerged beneath dark and stormy waves, but anon it reappears out on a calm sea, pursuing its peaceful voyage. We have an illustration of this on a grand scale in the great Protest and the bold assertion of Christian freedom during the XVI. century. With the reformation, in doctrine and practice, there was a corresponding reformation of the Church Year, which, noble and grand in its outlines, had well nigh been reduced to a *reductio ad absurdum*. The ever-increasing Saints' Days, which had overgrown and burdened the real Church Year, were swept away—actually, if not nominally, eliminated from the calendar. Only a few of them were allowed to remain in the cultus of the Evangelical Church, consisting chiefly of the festivals dedicated to the memory of the Apostles, who died the death of martyrs. Will the latter retain their credit? Possibly they may in some portions of the Protestant denominations, but even there they will never hold an equal rank with the great festivals that commemorate God's works and ways.

It is somewhat remarkable that St. John, the Evangelist, never had any memorial day, very likely because he was no martyr; and the same is true of St. Paul, although some almanacs give him a part of St. Peter's Day, on the 29th of June. The 29th of January, however, has been set apart to commemorate his conversion, and he is in this way best held

in remembrance. The circumcision of Christ, coinciding with the first of January, is significant as standing in close connection with His miraculous birth. As it regards the other saints, let them be held in devout remembrance, even if we can read of their names only in old martyrologies, or in our almanacs, where they still speak to us from year to year.

The festival of the Holy Innocents, on the 28th of December, and of All Saints' Day, on the 1st of November, are worthy of attention; the former, as illustrating the service of children in the Kingdom of God, and the latter as emphasizing the article of the Creed concerning the Communion of the Saints, at the right season of the year.

It would be proper for us here to speak of the pericopes, or Gospels and Epistles, appointed by the Church to be read in the services on the Lord's Day, but time will not permit. They are very ancient, and grew legitimately out of the Church Year, and are more or less well adapted to the seasons, during which they are to be read. They were selected with care by saintly men, from a deep Christian consciousness, from a proper regard to the spiritual wants of the people during the revolving year, and from a proper sense of the spirit and animus of the Church Year. The whole subject was exhaustively discussed by the Rev. Dr. Higbee, some eighteen and nineteen years ago, in a series of articles in the *MERCERSBURG REVIEW*. They evince ability, learning and research, and we can only refer to them here as setting forth "The Pericopes, or Selections of Gospels and Epistles of the Church" in a clear and satisfactory light.

In conclusion a few words in regard to the proper observance of the Church Year, and the benefits derived from such an observance. As a general thing, the Gospels and Epistles for the Sabbaths as they come and go, will serve as a guide. This, however, ought not to be done mechanically, else it will turn out to be a failure in the end. If we confine ourselves too rigidly to the lessons of the day; if, for instance, our thoughts or our sermons never go beyond the miracle at Cana of Gali-

lee on the second Sunday of Epiphany, or the conversation of Christ with Nicodemus on Trinity Sunday, we would find ourselves confined to a narrow channel for the supply of the water of life. But this is by no means a necessary alternative. There is room here for the exercise of ample freedom in our Sabbath and weekly meditations, which should always have regard to the day and season; but they should be in the spirit and scope, rather than in the lessons standing abstractly by themselves.

The development of the Church Year as a living organism implies a more or less liturgical service to express and emphasize its panoramic view of the Gospel. We need not only services and lessons for the seasons, but also prayers, and hymns, and spiritual songs. Hymn-books are now beginning to be constructed in the order of the Church Year, a step in advance, which is one of the most encouraging signs of the times. Hymns have a much wider influence than we sometimes suppose—on theology no less than on practical Christian life. Twenty-eight years ago, when liturgies, the Church Year and Apostles' Creed were as yet considerably below par in our Evangelical Churches, Dr. Thomas C. Porter, himself a hymnologist, thus wrote in the *MERCERSBURG REVIEW* in regard to the kind of a Hymn-Book needed in the Reformed Church. "Its arrangement should so blend the order of the Apostles' Creed and the Evangelical Church Year together, that in it the historical course of divine redemption, as well as the development of the Christian life from conversion and regeneration, on to the resurrection of the body and the fruition of heavenly bliss, should be mirrored forth in a simple, graphic and complete manner for practical use."

The benefit of observing times and seasons in this way seems to us incalculable. The Church Year may be said to be the most grand and comprehensive parable of the Gospel itself, illustrating each and every part of it. It secures to the congregation an opportunity to hear the whole counsel of God within the narrow space of a year, gives them, in fact, a popu-

lar treatise of theology, an exposition of all the articles of our Catholic, undoubted Christian faith, which grows in clearness and fullness as ministers and people grow in grace and in knowledge. Thus as travelers and sojourners in this vale of tears, we go on from one mount of blessing to another, in harmony with the seasons as they go and come, in harmony with one universal creed, in harmony with the New Testament, in harmony with the Baptismal formula, with the benediction, numerous doxologies, catechisms and, best of all, with the ever glorious Trinity. In our days, subjectivity with its whims and fancies is too far the order of the day, crowding out almost everything else. What we need most is the force of the objective facts of redemption, and the Church, therefore, has wisely given us one-half of the year, more particularly, for the consideration of the one, and the other half for making them the contents of our own Christian consciousness. Thus, with our eyes fixed on Christ, surrounded by "the glorious company of the Apostles," "the noble army of martyrs" and "the great cloud of witnesses," looking down upon us from the heavenly world, we cannot fail to grow in grace and knowledge, as the years come and go.

LANCASTER, PA.

VI.

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE ATOMIC THEORY.

BY PROF. R. C. SCHIEDT.

EVER since Democritus of Abdera gave to philosophy his theory of matter, so useful for natural research, and, like Leucippus and, later, Epicurus, defined matter as an aggregate of separate atoms, men have experimented with a view to finding *the nature of the primordial units*, which constitute the physical world. The learned Abderite, however, found only the formula for the expression of ideas, concerning the elementary constitution of the universe, which had been, centuries before him, prevalent in the East. When men first began to speculate on the phenomena of nature, vague hypotheses were put forth with regard to the essence of elements. In an arbitrary way, which must prevail in natural philosophy as long as deductions from previous experiments are not recognized, any kind and any number of things were declared to be elements, which distinction was due to nothing but the ignorance or prejudice of its originators.

The different theories which have been advanced by the different ancient philosophers with regard to the original element are alike erroneous. Among the Persians it was fire, among the Egyptians water, among the inhabitants of the Indies fire, water, ether, air and earth; whilst Thales, Anaximenes and Heraclitus arbitrarily chose one of them and maintained boldly that all other bodies were formed either by the condensation or the attenuation of this one element. The theories held during the Middle Ages, according to which all the metals are said to be composed of sulphur and mercury,

deserve the same criticism, and it can hardly be called progress when Basilus Valentinus, in the fifteenth century, added salt as the third constituent. These hypotheses are merely witnesses to a realistic symbology, adapted to the results which in the mean time had been obtained through the researches of the alchemists. They can be called ingenious without acknowledging that they were based on any scientific thinking whatever. Consequently there remain only a few thinkers, aside of Democritus, whose conception of matter deserves a special consideration in our time. Aristotle, who differed widely from Democritus, is one of them, and his system of natural history was well wrought out in all its conclusions.

It was an important step in advance when Van Helmont declared that neither fire nor water could be termed elements, because the one does not represent matter at all and the other possesses varying properties. But at last, in the seventeenth century, Robert Boyle taught that only undecomposable matter can be called elementary, and thus he expressed essentially that which we now, and perhaps always shall, acknowledge as the correct definition of an element. Of course, the progress of chemical analysis has also made this definition much clearer, and we do not know what the improved apparatus of future generations may accomplish. Whatever we regard as indivisible to-day may be found to be divisible to-morrow, just as certain substances which were thought to be compounds, have since been resolved into elements.

We must acknowledge, on the basis of the above-given statements, that it is hardly possible to furnish a definition for "element," which, while satisfying the older natural philosophy, is valid for all times; judicious naturalists, however, will be perfectly contented with Boyle's conception, considering that all beginnings are imperfect.

I.

Chemistry had at last surmounted the errors of a long past. The danger of falling a prey to its gold-fever or of becoming a fundamental annex to the medical science was avoided. At

the end of the last century there arose a Scheele and a Lavoisier whose genius called forth the splendid beginning of a new science. The long expected word that recognized combustion as the union of other bodies with oxygen had been spoken, and the times were ripe for the immortal works of Dalton and J. B. Richter, of Gay-Lussac and Alexander Von Humboldt, men who thought it not too bold to carry out the idea of measuring and weighing atoms. The disciples of chemistry—foremost among whom was the Scandinavian Berzelius, who followed the footsteps of his great countryman, Scheele—investigated with an almost feverish zeal the minerals of their northern home, as well as the constituents of plant and animal life, and in rapid succession the secrets of the organic and inorganic world were disclosed. The material which nature offers us was first separated, then further analyzed and defined as *mixtures*, which can be separated mechanically, as "*compounds*," which only chemical analysis can further resolve, and at last as "*elements*," which do not admit of any further division. What a chasm then between the nature of the element and the old fables of fire and water, of mercury, sulphur and salt! The few phantoms had disappeared and a large number of clearly-defined bodies had taken their place. We have oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen—those gases which resemble the air, which itself has lost its place among the elements because it has been recognized as a mixture of oxygen and nitrogen. Water, once put like air among the elements, appears now as a chemical combination of two elements. But bodies of entirely different qualities are added to the number of elements. Sulphur, phosphorus, chlorine maintain—in some cases only after a long struggle—their position as elements; a whole host of metals follow: iron, lead, mercury, copper, potassium, sodium and many others are, because indivisible, accepted as elements. And thus we see how the elements have increased, and are still increasing from day to day, so that we now know sixty-six elements, besides which there is a number of still doubtful ones, which have not yet been sufficiently investigated.

Has the universe been constructed out of these sixty-six elements? Or is it only our earth for which these substances served as building materials, and are there, in some other parts of the universe, other elements called to serve the same purpose? This question will, in the end, be never fully answered, but its limited solution has become possible through the results of the spectral analysis, which enables us to analyze by means of the light which they reflect even such bodies as are far removed from us. But the analysis of the sun, of many fixed stars and even of the vastly distant nebulae has proved that we, here also, meet with the identical elements as on earth, *i. e.*, it is probable that all elements are equally distributed throughout the whole universe. Could such a negative result, however, exclude entirely the existence of new elements? Is it impossible for future generations to find that which is unknown to us, or if it is, could there not be anywhere within or without the earth undiscovered elements?

What, then, is the change, which has taken place in the theory of elements since the year 1870? It was comparatively easy to explain the principles of Darwinism to the general public even twenty-five years ago. There you have to deal with organic beings, even with the human existence, and who would not take an interest in such topics? Regarding the progress of practical natural science, as, for instance, electrotechnics, the practical part of the discussion and aim, the opportunity of meeting with the ultimate results in daily life, is attractive for the reader, and sometimes forms the deceitful bridge which leads to a merely apparent understanding. How much more unfavorable for our undertaking! There is no connecting link with life, neither with its direct bearer nor with anything relating essentially to it. Our discussion has to do with *atoms*, of which we have as yet no definite physical idea,—yes, even worse, with *numbers*, which represent atomic weights and which, perhaps, call forth in many a reader reminiscences of some painful hours of his school-years, when he, without any taste or talent whatever for mathematics, was forced to follow

the dark paths of a deduction entirely strange to him. But I would like here to console those especially who expect something similar from this article. We very often find culture in the highest degree just among those who never came in any close contact with the study of mathematics or the natural sciences; and even if I acknowledge the difficulty of the task, I am, nevertheless, convinced that it is not insurmountable, and that the subject can be made intelligible for every cultured mind without the presupposition of any mathematical or scientific knowledge.

We turn the attention of the reader to the following table, upon which all known elements are alphabetically represented. It contains all the factors with which we have to work, *i. e.*, the names of sixty-six elements and their atomic weights. By these weights we still express, as formerly, only relative values. The united efforts of modern physics and chemistry have, indeed, enabled us to calculate with probability the real absolute weight of an atom, but not as yet to give its definite value. But we know definitely that an atom of oxygen weighs sixteen times as much as an atom of hydrogen, and we signify that by marking the weight of oxygen 16, and that of hydrogen 1. These numbers do not refer to grams or fractions of grams, but the atomic weight of each element is expressed by that number which tells how many times heavier its atom is than that of hydrogen. So, for instance, the first line of the table, "Aluminium 27.4," simply means that one atom of aluminium possesses the weight of 27.4 atoms of hydrogen.

The table contains all the atomic weights according to the latest investigations.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Atomic weight.</i>	<i>Name.</i>	<i>Atomic weight.</i>
Aluminium	27.4	Bromine.....	79.76
Antimony	119.6	Cadmium	111.7
Arsenic	74.9	Cesium.....	132.7
Barium.....	136.86	Calcium.....	39.91
Beryllium	9.8	Carbon	11.97
Bismuth.....		Cerium.....	141.2
Boron	10.9	Chlorine.....	35.37

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Atomic weight.</i>	<i>Name.</i>	<i>Atomic weight.</i>
Chromium	52.45	Platinum	194.3
Cobalt.....	58.6	Potassium.....	39.3
Copper.....	63.18	Rhodium	104.1
Didymium.....	145	Rubidium	85.2
Erbium.....	166	Ruthenium	103.5
Fluorine.....	19.6	Samarium	150
Gallium.....	69.9	Scandium.....	43.97
Gold	196.2	Selenium.....	78.87
Hydrogen.....	1	Silicon.....	28
Indium.....	113.4	Silver	107.66
Iodine.....	126.54	Sodium.....	23
Iridium.....	192.5	Strontium.....	87.3
Iron	55.88	Sulphur	31.98
Lanthanum.....	138.5	Tantalum.....	182
Lead	206.39	Tellurium.....	127.7
Lithium.....	7.1	Terbium.....	148.57
Magnesium.....	24	Thorium.....	231.96
Manganese.....	54.8	Tin.....	117.35
Mercury.....	199.8	Titanium.....	50.25
Molybdenum.....	95.9	Tungsten	183.6
Nickel.....	58.6	Uranium.....	239.8
Niobium.....	93.7	Vanadium.....	51.1
Nitrogen.....	14.1	Ytterbium.....	172.6
Osmium.....	195	Yttrium.....	89.6
Oxygen.....	15.96	Zinc.....	64.88
Palladium.....	106	Zirconium.....	90.4
Phosphorus	30.96		

A glance at this table will at once convince the reader that neither law nor rule governs these numbers ; simple relations cannot be established among them nor can they be brought into mutual relation by treating them as simple multiples of one and the same unit which lies at the basis of all. To search after such an arithmetical as well as substantial unit among the atoms, reminds one indeed at first of the sad failures of the dreams of former alchemists, who aimed at nothing less than to prepare a precious metal from a common one. Nevertheless, the attempt has been made to find the common basis for all the different values of this table ; but not, as was formerly the case, by dreamers and deceivers, but by the most earnest men,

whose efforts have carried with them success, although not according to their original plans.

A hypothesis which is as simple as it possibly could be, with regard to the connection of elementary atoms, was first proposed by Prout in 1815. He maintained that hydrogen was the basis of all matter, and that by a union of its atoms all other elements were formed. The atomic weight of silver, *e. g.*, is 108, *i. e.*, one atom of silver weighs 108 times as much as an atom of hydrogen. According to Prout, an atom of silver is formed by the union of 108 atoms of hydrogen, in such a way that they constitute an entirely different and new atom called silver. An atom of oxygen would accordingly consist of 16 atoms of hydrogen, and an atom of nitrogen of 14 atoms of hydrogen. Unfortunately, this simple hypothesis could not be sustained in the face of opposing facts, for it is evident that if it were correct, all atomic weights would have to be entire multiples of that of hydrogen, *i. e.*, whole numbers, without fractions. But we know to-day what was not known by Prout—that the atomic weight of silver is not fully 108, but more correctly only $107\frac{3}{4}$. In the sense of Prout, silver would have to consist of $107\frac{3}{4}$ atoms of hydrogen, which is absurd, if hydrogen is to be indivisible, for fractions of a first element are an impossibility. And still more confusing would be the relative weight of chlorine, which is not even 35.5, but 35.37. Compared with Prout's hypothesis, an atom of chlorine would consist of 35 units and .37 of an atom of hydrogen, *i. e.*, an atom would have to be divided in fractions of one-hundredths, which leads to the overthrow of the hypothesis. And this had necessarily to be its fate, at least in its first form, in which it could not be maintained, though it contains a fundamental truth. The investigation of this has been the untiring effort of chemists in spite of the first failure of Prout's hypothesis. Those simple relations which Prout first established, and to which he had a full right on account of the insufficient data of atomic weight, do not, of course, lessen the truth. But we have become more and more convinced that there are certain relations between the atoms and the

numbers which express their weight. There are too many reasons at hand for these hypotheses to be surrendered.

The impulse to search again and again for a single element or principle of matter grows out of all philosophical thinking, which, however, furnishes reasons appealing more to intuitive than to empirical thought. In the whole universe, as was said before, the same elements are to be found—the earth, the sun, the most distant stars, are, as far as we can judge, not essentially different in their qualitative combinations. And just as we meet the same few elements, to whatever remote point of the universe spectral analysis enables us to penetrate, so we must, also, on the other hand, find the same unit in the microscopic world. We shrink from the supposition that there should be ultimate atoms in every element, so that every one would represent a world in itself, entirely different from any other and without being connected by a bridge. No scholar will willingly and gladly admit that lithium and potassium, oxygen and carbon, silver and copper are absolutely different elements without containing certain original constituents in common, since we find nothing in the remotest worlds which is principally different from the material constituents of our planet.

Certain facts based on definite numerical relations appeal much more convincingly to our reason than these contrary statements, which at present can neither be proved nor disproved, and therefore must fall to the ground before the judgment bar of strict reasoning. These numerical affinities appear in certain elements which have a remarkable physical and chemical resemblance to one another. Let us examine them for a moment. We will take three of the large number of metals, which in their whole demeanor bear so striking a resemblance to one another, in their physical properties as well as in their peculiar chemical character. All three are exceptionally light, very sensitive to the open air, and possess the peculiar property of dissolving, with signs of combustion, when brought into contact with water. These properties may be mentioned here simply to touch upon

the sameness of character and great similarity of the three metals which are so very different from other elements, such as iron, gold or silver. The names of these three metals are: lithium, sodium, potassium; their weights: lithium, 7; sodium, 23; potassium, 39. A glance at these numbers shows that the atomic weight of sodium is by 16 larger than that of lithium, for $7 + 16$ are 23, and, further, the atomic weight of potassium is by 16 larger than that of sodium, for $23 + 16 = 39$. In other words, the atomic weight of sodium stands between that of lithium and potassium. Their striking similarity leads us to the conclusion that this numerical difference is not merely accidental, but we must maintain that an atom of sodium is nothing else than an atom of lithium to which an unknown something representing the weight 16 is added, and that potassium bears the same relation to sodium. This could be expressed thus:

One atom of lithium has the weight, 7.

One atom of sodium would be $= 1 \text{ atom of lithium} + 16 = 23$.

One atom of potassium would be $= 1 \text{ atom of lithium} + 2 \times 16 = 39$, or
 $= 1 \text{ atom of sodium} + 16 = 39$.

This hypothesis, however vague it appears at first glance, becomes clearer when we compare certain *chemical combinations*, when similar numerical affinities are found, and when we learn that all these can be traced back with full certainty to one cause common with that hypothesis: the three acids—acetic acid, formic and propion—bear as great a resemblance to one another as the three metals,—lithium, sodium and potassium. But these acids are not elements, but *combinations*; all three consist of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen; only each one contains different proportions. We know now through analysis that acetic acid is nothing else but formic acid to which one atom of carbon (atomic weight, 12) and two atoms of hydrogen (2 weights) have been added. It is evident that they differ from one another in their atomic weights by $12 + 2$, i. e., 14. And we know likewise that the propion acid differs from acetic acid in the same proportion, i. e., that the former again contains one atom of carbon (at. w. 12) plus two of hy-

drogen (at. w. 2) more than the latter. When these three acids, which in their properties show analogies similar to those of the three metals, present a steadily recurring numerical difference of 14, which is here with great certainty to be traced back to the fact that the one originated through the other by an addition of certain well-known atoms, then it seems more than probable that similar causes determine the mutual relations of those three metals, *i. e.*, that these three so-called elements deviate from one another by definite differences of combination, and that they therefore have or are a combination, and consequently no *true elements*.

Whoever is inclined to look upon the peculiar affinity of lithium, sodium and potassium skeptically as being merely accidental will no longer be able to uphold his objections as soon as he convinces himself that just these very same three metals represent only one of the great number of examples which lead to the same result. Not only here, but generally, it is shown that wherever three elements bear a remarkable resemblance to one another in their chemical and physical properties, the same affinity is found. Their atomic weights show the same analogous numerical differences as seen so strikingly in the above example. Thus the elements chlorine, bromine, iodine, further sulphur, selenium, tellurium, also potassium, rubidium, caesium, form natural groups each of three elements, whose properties are strikingly analogous, and, in fact, we observe that even in their atomic weights the same regularity, at least, appropriately occurs.

These remarkable affinities have been, for some time back, the study of chemists, and numerous eminent scholars, especially Döbereiner, Gmelin, Dumas, Pettenkofer and others, have referred to them. However the number of "triads"—as such a group of three elements was called—increased, the peculiarity remained confined to every three elements, and proved quite unsatisfactory for the derivation of a law which would comprise *all* the elements. Thus the desire of the chemists to establish Prout's theory had to be satisfied with mere

attempts, which had disproved the latter's hypothesis, but a theory of elements, which would answer the problem of ultimate causes and at the same time ratify the results of past experiments, remained a mere desideratum.

II.

The revolution in the theory of atoms, which brought the numerous preparatory labors to a conclusion and the so much desired end very much nearer, is due to the research of a number of scholars, among whom we mention especially the Russian scholar *Mendelejeff*, and next to him the German *Lothar Meyer*. The former, gifted with a power of observation and a boldness for speculation which will remain for all time to come an object of admiration, did not only understand how to gather the fruit which time had matured, but he knew, at the same time, how, to mature by the rays of his creative imagination, those which were not yet developed, to a degree only anticipated by him. More modest, but also of lasting value, is the merit of his German colleague. Less boldly than Mendelejeff gazing into endless distances, and at first adhering to facts thoroughly established, *Lothar Meyer* proved, only a few years later than the former, the connection which exists between the qualities of elements and their atomic weights, and he must be called, next to Mendelejeff, one of the founders of the natural system of elements.

Guided by the idea that the anticipated law could not be confined to a small number of elements only, these scholars undertook an investigation which extended over all known atomic weights. All the elements were arranged simply according to the magnitude of their atomic weights, brought under one series which begins with the smallest atomic weight and ends with the largest, and now by careful consideration of all chemical and physical properties of the elements they investigated the affinities which might exist between the *number of the atomic weight* and the *character of the element*. And, indeed, here they met with success. Giving due prominence to the hitherto almost

unnoticed *specific volume* of the elements, they discovered an apparently simple relation between the atomic weights and the volume of the elements, which, though not confirmed in all cases, led to a further investigation of the subject. And there it became soon apparent that certain lines with definite demarcation, which seemed at first to have a regular ending, were suddenly interrupted, and the establishment of a definite law became impossible. Hitherto the order of elements, arranged according to the scale of their atomic weights, had been, up to a certain point, such an one as to agree with the anticipated law; now there arose all at once gaps and divergencies. Where, on the one hand, a definite atomic number was to be expected, the pertinent element was wanting, and, on the other hand, there appeared in the scale of elements, which, until then, was in accord with their properties, every now and then such ones, whose properties predicted an entirely different position in the system, and, therefore, another atomic weight. Such gaps and obstacles could not be removed simply by continued investigation. The alternative arose: either to give up the path hitherto followed, because it was not continuous, or the chasms which interrupted it had to be bridged over artificially, the obstacles in the way had to be forcibly removed. And the spirit of investigation seized upon this bold device. Though it was naturally impossible to add new elements to fill up the gaps, and though the atomic *values* prevented a final decision in favor of the anticipated rule, the far-seeing imagination found, nevertheless, an exit; wherever gaps appeared it inserted elements hitherto unknown, leaving their experimental discovery to the future; and those atomic numbers which seemed to be in an inexplicable contradiction to the properties of the elements belonging to them were explained as incorrectly defined and changed in such a way that they now adapted themselves to the law.

It is easily understood that such a treatment, apparently entirely arbitrary, called forth quite spirited discussion and criticism. A law which, for the sake of obtaining authority, was

forced to set aside a number of apparently established facts and to predict new ones, not yet discovered, caused the gravest doubts. And its authors deserve admiration because they were not in the least frightened by these difficulties and by the force of such overwhelming objections, but boldly trusted in their final victory. Indeed, the arbitrariness of their procedure was unheard of; nevertheless, there were many ways and means at hand to examine their right, and to decide upon the basis of facts, whether that which their imagination had produced would vanish like every structure of mere imagination or whether it would obtain the right of being acknowledged as a scientific truth. That was tried first of all with those atomic weights which the author of the theory had declared incorrect, because they contradicted their theory. Thus the impulse was given to define, by new experiments, more fully the doubtful atomic weights, and to ascertain whether indeed the old hitherto adopted numbers had been incorrect. And here the new theory was crowned with the first success, surprising to all. It was really proved that the old atomic numbers which Mendelejeff and Lothar Meyer had doubted, and for which they had substituted their new ones, had been formerly incorrectly stated, and that the new experiments led just to those values which had been prophesied by those scholars on the basis of their rule or law.

A remarkable combination of happy coincidences greatly helped to attract the general attention to the very first favorable results which showed themselves here, and to gain friends for the new doctrine. Among those elements to which the law could not be adapted, there was a metal, *Indium*, to which the atomic weight of 75.6 had been given on the basis of careful but incomplete experiments. But this number required a place to be assigned to it, to which its character did not at all correspond. And Mendelejeff and Meyer at the same time reached the conclusion that this number was incorrect and that the atomic weight of Indium was really to be expressed by the number 113.4, which exactly fitted in the chain. At the same

time, Bunsen, of Heidelberg, undertook his famous experiments with the ice calorimeter. His investigations comprised also the properties of Indium, and they led him to examine experimentally the atomic weight of this metal. The number which he found was indeed 113.4, and thus the prognosis was confirmed. The impression which this experiment made was the more remarkable since Bunsen, at that time, could not have known of the labors of Mendelejeff and Meyer, and, therefore, the result found entirely by speculations, was ratified by experiments made in altogether foreign quarters. But this was not the only successful achievement. In rapid succession, one after the other of the doubtful atomic weights was assigned its right place by zealous chemists, and, by impartial experiment, found the number which answered the prognosis.

After such results the new doctrine was no longer criticised. Whenever hypothetical elements hitherto undiscovered were inserted in certain gaps in order to form a group—the criticism changed afterwards into admiration, whenever some of the predicted elements were discovered and their atomic numbers were found to confirm the prognosis. The theory gained thus such a general recognition that no chemist to-day denies their significance, and that the *natural system* of elements, in spite of the remarkable complications which it represents, is nevertheless recognized as the expression of the great regularity in nature.

III.

Arranging all elements according to their atomic weight, and leaving out hydrogen, as being the basis of all, we recognize the remarkable fact that the elements are naturally grouped according to two kinds of series. We distinguish the two *smaller series*, each comprising seven elements, and the *large series*, consisting each of seventeen elements. There are certain conditions which determine the combination of these series. The elements of one series do not resemble one another, neither in regard to their properties nor in regard to their chemical character, but when we compare the second series with the first,

we find that each element of the one has a corresponding element in the other, even in the order of their succession. Therefore, if two series, in which the elements are arranged according to their atomic weight, are placed side by side, we find always two elements aside of each other which have similar chemical and physical properties, and have, therefore, been recognized as relatives long before the law was known.

In order to illustrate the above, we give the first two series containing those elements which possess the smallest atomic weights hitherto found. They form the two "small series" of Mendelejeff, which consist each of seven elements, and are here arranged so that there is, aside of every element, the pertinent atomic number.

Lithium	7	Sodium	23
Beryllium	9	Magnesium	24
Borium.....	11	Aluminum.....	27
Carbon.....	12	Silicium	28
Nitrogen.....	14	Phosphorus.....	31
Oxygen.....	16	Sulphur.....	32
Fluorine.....	19	Chlorine.....	35.4

A glance at the regularly increasing atomic numbers shows, that the arrangement is perfectly natural and without any artificial devices. The more surprising is, therefore, the fact that the chemist really finds in every element of the *second* series the *natural analogue of its neighbor in the first*. Lithium and sodium stand aside of each other, and have always been acknowledged by the chemist as belonging together because of their similarity of character; so it is with beryllium and magnesium, with borium and silicium, oxygen and sulphur—all are natural pairs of elements. But still more convincing the law of natural series becomes, if we do not confine ourselves to the two small groups, but take also the larger ones consisting each of 17 elements.

It may, therefore, be permitted to add the two next great series, and a third one which, however, consists only of five known elements, leaving out the last series, which is somewhat vague:

SMALL SERIES.		LARGE SERIES.		
First Series.	Second Series.	Third Series.	Fourth Series.	Fifth Series.
Lithium..... 7	Sodium..... 23	Potassium... 39	Rubidium... 85	Cæsium.....133
Beryllium... 9	Magnesium. 24	Calcium..... 40	Strontium... 87	Barium.....137
Boron..... 11	Aluminum... 27	Scandium... 44	Yttrium.....89.6	L'han'm...138.5
		Titanium.... 48	Zirconium...90.4	Cerium.....141
		Vanadium... 51	Niobium..... 94	Didymium..145
		Chromium...52.5	Molybdenum. 96	
		Manganese.. 55 ?		
		Iron..... 56	Ruthenium. 108	
Carbon..... 12	Silicium..... 28	Cobalt..... 59	Rhodium....104	
		Nickel..... 59	Palladium...106	
		Copper..... 63	Silver.....108	
		Zinc..... 65	Cadmium...112	
		Gallium....69.9	Iridium...118.4	
		?	Tin.....117.4	
Nitrogen..... 14	Phosphorus. 31	Arsenic..... 75	Antimony...120	
Oxygen..... 16	Sulphur..... 32	Selenium.... 79	Tellurium...127	
Fluorine..... 19	Chlorine....35.4	Bromium.... 80	Iodine.....127	

A glance at this table is sufficient to show how accurately this grouping into natural series combines the really related elements. In every horizontal line all the elements which naturally belong together are found, with the only exception of carbon and silicium, whose properties resemble, on the one hand, those of titanium and zirconium, on the other, those of tin, and are therefore especially indicated by dotted lines. Take, for instance, the first horizontal line, containing lithium, sodium, potassium, rubidium and cæsium. We have mentioned them before. Lithium, sodium and potassium form together one triad, showing in a remarkable way common properties, which are so distributed that sodium always stands in the middle. But the same holds true of potassium, rubidium and cæsium, which had attracted attention as one of the most striking examples among the triads. But the common relations of both groups, the steady increase of all properties beginning with lithium, the least electro-positive, and ending with cæsium, the

most electro-positive of all known elements, is represented in this line in a most emphatic manner.

It will hardly be a matter of surprise that we find here all triads, formerly looked upon as wonders because so little understood, united in the most natural way; so in the second horizontal line: calcium, strontium, barium; in the last the three true halogens, chlorine, bromine, iodine, which have the most striking family resemblance among all the elements, and to which we may add fluorine, as standing next to chlorine. The table shows also, in a very complete way, the electro-chemical character of the elements, by representing the alkali metals, the five most positive of all bodies, in the first line, but the most electro-negative halogens, in the last. It is, however, impossible for us, without encroaching upon the sphere of the specialist, to point out the surprising variety of relations which exists in this arrangement between the place of the element in the system and its chemical and physical properties—it would be unintelligible to the average reader. We shall, therefore, pass on and explain in a few words the gaps which occur in the table. There is one between gallium and arsenic. These gaps, filled out by interrogation points, signify elements not yet discovered, and it must be supposed that there is an unknown element, whose atomic weight will be between 69.9 and 75, and whose properties will be similar to those of tin, which is found to the right in the table. The same is true of the gap between molybdenum and ruthenium, it is to be filled out by an element whose atomic weight will possess a value lying between 96 and 108.

But does not such a prediction appear too bold an undertaking? Is it legitimate to predict elements, which have not yet been detected in nature and for whose existence we have no other proofs but merely numerical regularities—and even more, is it legitimate to assume such elements as really existing in our chemical and physical calculation? Indeed, such prognoses, which remind us of Le Verrier's prediction of the then invisible planet Neptune, required not only the firm conviction

of the truth of the law, but also that courage which, without fearing mockery and defeat, thinks it its duty to proclaim a truth even then, when there is no probability of its acceptance. Mendelejeff possessed such a courage, and success followed sooner than anybody could have imagined. At the time when the talented Russian published his tables, the number of the known elements was much smaller than to-day. Two elements (scandium and gallium), to be found in the third vertical line of the above given table, were yet undiscovered, which made the regularity, so clear now, appear somewhat vague. Mendelejeff did not hesitate a moment to prognosticate the existence of these two metals, for which assumption there was at that time not the least actual ground; but besides he defined, with a prophetic insight, not only the numbers of their atomic weight, but also the most important properties of these yet undiscovered elements. This prognosis, ridiculed in the beginning, was in a comparatively short time confirmed by facts. The French naturalist, Lecoq de Boisbaudran, discovered, soon after Mendelejeff's prognosis, a new metal, which he called *gallium*. This answered most accurately Mendelejeff's definition. The same is true of *scandium*, discovered by Nelson.

In how far these prognoses harmonize with the real facts becomes evident from the following: Mendelejeff predicted for gallium an atomic weight of about 68, and a specific gravity of about 6. The real values discovered by experiments came very near the prognosis, *i. e.*, atomic weight 69.9 and specific gravity 5.9.

Thus we have to-day the general law which refers all chemical elements to one great family; their natural relations are defined by unmistakable rules, and the illusion is removed, which considered them as independent, separate little worlds. Of course the dream of Prout, whose keen speculations were contradicted by experiments, has not yet met with its realization. But the fundamental truth contained in it—the unity of matter varying only in its expression—has received valuable support through the theory of the natural classification, and all experi-

mental investigations, whose object is a further analysis of the elements appear anew hopeful and legitimate. Such experiments meet with great difficulties, and are therefore comparatively rare. Nevertheless they have been undertaken, and not without success.

Some eight or nine years ago Prof. Victor Meyer of Zurich and shortly afterward Professors Crafts, Huth and Muir undertook to subject certain elements to very high degrees of heat in order to ascertain whether they could not observe some changes. Oxygen, nitrogen, mercury and other elements were subjected to white heat, which only vessels made of platinum or very fine porcelain can withstand. In a temperature of 1650 degrees Centigrade, measured by an air thermometer made of porcelain, these elements remained unchanged. But not all showed the same resistance. The group of the halogens, chlorine, bromine and iodine betrayed a certain degree of variation under the influence of heat. At a temperature of 1000 degrees Celsius their density is lessened and every increase of temperature causes a separation of their double molecules into isolated atoms, so that the specific gravity of their vapor retains only one-half of its normal value. This result was reached wholly in the case of iodine, with the other halogens only approximately, because their complete decomposition requires a temperature which the material of the thermometers could not bear. Such experiments prove, therefore, that the molecules of elements can be divided into free atoms; but a decomposition of elements into matter qualitatively differing, or the derivation of a *prima materia* from them has not yet been accomplished.

Returning finally to the results which the law of natural classification has disclosed to us, we have to acknowledge the mutual dependence of *property* and *atomic weight*, but especially the close *inter-relationship of all the elements*, and in the end the great probability of a *prima materia*, from which they all proceeded. And although it has been proved that that which we call to-day an atom of hydrogen does not represent the true original unit, can we not assume that this predicate belongs to

a fraction of it? Its size and nature we can not define; that problem, at which the most prominent scholars of the present time are working, remains yet to be solved. But it will be solved, as well as many other questions, which the atomic doctrine has not yet answered; but we acknowledge that this natural classification of elements is a mighty stride forward towards a final solution. There is only one aim for the naturalist and it must be reached. The dogma of its impossibility belongs to the past.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Philip Schaff, Professor of Church History in the Union Seminary, New York. Volume VI., *Modern Christianity: the German Reformation, A.D. 1517-1530.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888. Price, \$4.00.

We in the Reformed Church naturally have a laudable feeling of pride in the gradual growth towards completion of Dr. Schaff's Church History. We have followed its production, volume by volume, since the time when the first volume in the German language was published in the retired village of Mercersburg, while he was professor in our Reformed Seminary there. A large portion of that already published has been revised and rewritten, so that now the volumes are uniform, not only in plan and style, but, in being brought up to the latest literature and research. In other words, Dr. Schaff has not allowed the earlier volumes to fall behind the times whilst he has been writing the later ones.

The present volume is numbered the sixth in the course. The fifth is not yet published. The fourth volume is the first one on the *Middle Ages*, reaching from Gregory the Great to Hildebrand, or Gregory VII. The second, not yet published, will cover the period from Hildebrand to the Reformation. We can, perhaps, better afford to wait for that than for those on the Protestant Reformation. The present volume is occupied with the Lutheran Reformation in Germany, 1517-1530.

We are better able to understand the Reformation now than at an earlier period. The polemic and partisan spirit between Romanism and Protestantism has largely died out, and the historian can come to his work more unbiassed than formerly. Moreover, as Protestantism reveals more and more its spirit and aim by its history, its formative period in the sixteenth century can be better understood.

It is hardly necessary to say that the present volume is a masterly work. Not only is it unusually rich and thorough in the mastery of the sources and material, to which Dr. Schaff has devoted much time and attention in his visits to the land of the Reformation, and the universities and libraries of Europe, but it manifests on every page the broad catholicity and ripeness of the author's own mind

and spirit. Full justice is done to the Roman Catholic Church, while there is no yielding to the narrowness and bigotry of those Roman Catholic writers who so grossly pervert this chapter of history. And full justice is done to Luther and the Lutheran Reformat on, although the author is himself not a Lutheran but belongs to a Reformed church. Yet the depiction of the great German reformer is not in the spirit of hero-worship, but his weaknesses and imperfections are honestly and faithfully presented; in short, it is a picture of the whole man, Luther. Dr. Schaff has the genius of the historian in the fullness and clearness with which he represents his subject. We know of no church historian, living or dead, possessed of equal ability to give a clear representation of every phase of Church life and development. We pray that his life may be spared to complete his work, which, when completed, will undoubtedly be the greatest Church History which this age has produced.

This volume, and the one to follow it, should be introduced, not only into theological libraries, theological seminaries, and the libraries of ministers, but into the family libraries also of our intelligent laity. We shall await with great interest the next volume on the Swiss and Calvinistic Reformation, or rather, perhaps, on what is comprehended under the Reformed side of the Reformation, as distinguished from the Lutheran, extending to countries outside of Germany. The Lutheran Church in particular, and the Protestant Church in general, owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Schaff for the faithfulness and ability with which he has performed his work in this volume.

A MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Dr. Bernhard Weiss, ober-Konsistorialrath and Professor of Theology. Translated from the German by A. J. K. Davidson. In two volumes. Vol. I. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. MDCCCLXXXVII. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Astor Place. Price of the American edition, \$2.00 per volume.

During my last visit to Europe, while spending a short time in Berlin, I embraced the opportunity of visiting the celebrated University there, the largest and most celebrated now in Germany, and of hearing a lecture by Dr. Weiss, and one also by Professor Koftan. At the close of Dr. Weiss' lecture I introduced myself to him by handing him my card, and was afforded a brief but kindly interview. After parting I followed him with my eyes as he walked across the large courtyard of the University, with his scholarly stoop, and having his lecture book under his arm, until he passed out into the street and was lost to view in the crowded thoroughfare of the great city. I had read his large work, "The Life of Christ," with much interest, and it was to me a great privilege to see and hear the great New Testament scholar. If I mistake not, his department is N. T. Literature and Exegesis. The lecture I heard was in N. T. Exegesis, on a section in the Epistle to the Romans.

Professor Koftan's lecture was in Doctrines, on Christian Baptism.

The work here noticed bears evidence of the author's entire familiarity with his subject. It ranks among the ripened fruit of his thirty-four years of teaching. The introduction to this Introduction contains a notice of the founders of this science in the Patristic, Mediæval, and Reformation age, the writers since the Reformation on criticism and Apologetics from Semler to Neander, then the Tübingen School and its opponents, and finally the present state of the science. Then follows Part First, the history of the origin of the New Testament Canon, while Part Second gives the history of the origin of the New Testament writings, or the several books in particular. This method is just the opposite of Bleek's, who gives the history of the particular books first, and of the Canon afterwards. This volume gets through the Pastoral Epistles, leaving the Catholic Epistles and the Apokalypse, with other matter for the second volume.

Dr. Weiss, in his preface, quotes the saying of Holtzman, that Christianity has been a "book-religion" from the beginning, and then adds: "In answer to this, I can only say, God be praised that it is not so. The opposition of any conception of the New Testament to that of many critical tendencies, is perhaps most sharply concentrated in this antithesis. Christianity has from the beginning been Life; and because this life pulsates in its primitive documents, these cannot be explained or understood on the hypothesis of 'literary dependences.'" One can feel in his reproduction of the outline of the several epistles, that each one to him is something living, and the author moves in full sympathy with this life. This work of Dr. Weiss is fully up with the latest and best scholarship of this age on the subject here treated.

HISTORICAL LIGHTS: Six Thousand Quotations from Standard Histories and Biographies, with Twenty Thousand Cross-references, and a General Index, also an Index of Personal Names. Compiled by Rev. Charles E. Little, Author of "*Biblical Lights and Side-Lights*." Second Edition. Funk & Wagnalls: New York, 18 and 20 Astor Place, London: 44 Fleet Street. 1888. Price \$5.00.

This is a large octavo volume of nearly a thousand pages. The six thousand, two hundred and twenty-three extracts which make up the body of the work consist chiefly of historical and biographical facts and incidents that have been gathered from the writings of not less than forty-nine distinguished authors. They relate to a great variety of subjects, as their number itself indicates, and "are designed for those who desire ready access to the events, the lessons and the precedents of history in the preparation of addresses, essays and sermons, also in pleading at the bar, in discussing political issues and in writing for the press." At the head of each passage quoted

the subject which it illustrates is stated in large type, and the subjects themselves are arranged in alphabetical order. Besides this, a very complete index of personal names, and a general index of topics with cross-references, are given, by means of which the entire contents of the book are placed within easy reach, so that any subject illustrated or fact presented can be readily referred to. For the purpose designed the work could be, indeed, scarcely more complete than it is. Moreover, as a cyclopædia of practical quotations for the use of public speakers or writers it is, in our opinion, unsurpassed in value, inasmuch as history is, as Carlyle well says, "philosophy teaching by experience," and, therefore, its facts and incidents always carry with them the greatest force and interest in the illustration of truths and principles of action. But the work will be found serviceable not only to those who are called upon to address others, but to all who are interested in acquainting themselves with striking and suggestive incidents of history. As a volume to be taken up for reading at spare moments it is especially well suited and without a superior in point of excellency. The various passages of history and of biography of which it is composed are not only brief and complete in themselves, but they are also without exception entertaining and instructive. In more than one respect therefore this volume will prove a valuable possession to those who may purchase it.

THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE; OR, Passages out of the Gospels Exhibiting the Twelve Disciples of Jesus under Discipline for the Apostleship. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Author of "The Humiliation of Christ," "The Parabolic Teaching of Christ," "The Miraculous Elements in the Gospels," etc. Fourth Edition Revised and Improved. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1889. Price \$2.50.

Dr. Bruce is well known as the author of a number of important theological treatises, all of which are characterized by superior scholarship and vigorous thought. The present work first appeared in 1871, and at once attracted marked attention and favor. The fact that it has now reached a fourth Edition is in itself a strong testimony as to its usefulness and value. As indicated in its title, it treats of our Lord's training of His twelve chosen disciples for the work of their calling. It is accordingly an extended commentary on some of the most important parts of the Gospels, and throws much light on some of the most difficult passages in them. The contents of the book are divided into thirty-one chapters. Among the subjects discussed in these chapters are, Beginnings, Fishers of Men, The Twelve, Lessons on Prayer, Lessons in Religious Liberty, First Attempts at Evangelism, Peter's Confession, The Transfiguration, Training in Temper, Judas Iscariot, The Dying Parent and the Little Ones, The Intercessory Prayer, The Shepherd Restored, The Under Shepherds Admonished, Power from on High, and

Waiting. From these subjects an idea may be formed of the nature of the entire volume. As all the subjects considered are treated in a most masterly and attractive manner, the work is both highly instructive and highly interesting. We heartily commend it therefore to all our readers as well worth a place in the library of every one who is interested in the great questions pertaining to the Christian religion.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. By Thomas Charles Edwards, D.D., Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. Price \$1.50.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is admittedly one of the most profoundly interesting and difficult books of the New Testament. In this volume, which forms one of the series known as the "Expositor's Bible" edited by Rev. W. R. Nicholl, the author's sole aim is to trace the unity of thought that characterizes the Epistle, and to do this in such a way as to meet the needs of those who have no knowledge of Greek and desire only to be assisted in their efforts to understand the meaning and connection of the sacred author's ideas. The book is not in the strict sense of the term a commentary, but a series of Expository lectures in which, while criticism is rigidly excluded, great pains is nevertheless taken to bring out the real meaning and force of the words used by the inspired writer. Dr. Edwards purposely refrains from discussing the authorship of the Epistle on the ground that he has no new light to throw on the Enigma; but he states in his preface that he is convinced that "St. Paul is neither the actual author nor the originator of the treatise." Like the preceding volumes of the same series this volume is a work of decided merit and will be found useful not only by laymen, but also by theological students and ministers.

THE SERMON BIBLE. Genesis to II Samuel. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 714 Broadway. 1888. Price \$1.50.

This is the first volume of a series to be completed in twelve volumes, and which is to include the entire Scriptures. Its aim is to give the essence of the best homiletic literature of this generation. In connection with different verses of the different chapters and books of Scripture, sketches of sermons by distinguished pulpit orators are given. There are also in addition references to volumes of sermons by noted preachers and theologians in which sermons on the same texts are to be found. As a means of studying the homiletic methods of eminent divines, the work will consequently be found highly serviceable, and, so far as it promotes such study, will prove a benefit to its possessor; but as a direct source from which to get plans of sermons for personal use it will be sure to do injury. For while a minister's careful study of the methods of effective preachers with a view to discover wherein their strength lies, and to

improve his own method of sermonizing, is always profitable, his using the plans of others as a mere crutch cannot fail in the end to cripple and weaken his power of invention and of logical presentation of truth. The value of this volume will therefore depend wholly on the use made of it.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION—Explained and Vindicated. By Basil Manly, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 714 Broadway. 1888. Price \$1.25.

This book treats, in an admirable manner, of an interesting and most important subject. The object of the author in preparing it was not to present any new theory, but simply to set forth what after a careful and thorough study of the subject he believes to be the Bible Doctrine of Inspiration. "The Bible statement and the Bible phenomena," he claims, "are the decisive consideration in the case." He also claims that "originality in a subject like this, which has been under discussion for centuries, would surely be error." At the same time, however, he believes that "there may be, after all, honest independence of inquiry, a careful sifting of opinions, a fair recasting of views in the mould of one's own thinking, and a subordination of the whole simply to the controlling authority of God's Word." The work itself consists of three parts.

In part first the importance of the subject is considered, some sources of misapprehension are pointed out, distinctions to be noticed are discussed, a summary of the principal views now prevalent is presented, and what the author holds to be the Biblical doctrine is negatively and positively stated. Dr. Manly denies that Inspiration is "mechanical" or "destructive of consciousness, self-control or individuality," but, at the same time, stoutly maintains that "it is not merely a natural elevation of the faculties, analogous to the stimulus of passion and enthusiasm, or to poetic genius." He defines it as "that divine influence that secures the accurate transference of truth into human language by a speaker or writer, so as to be communicated to other men." In consequence of it, he claims that "the Bible is truly the Word of God, having both infallible truth and divine authority in all that it affirms or enjoins."

Part second is devoted to the proofs of inspiration. First the presumptive argument is presented, and the nature of the direct evidence to be expected considered. Then the direct proofs are given. These are found in the general manner of quoting Scripture in Scripture, in passages implying the inspiration of the Bible as a whole, in declarations of the inspiration of particular passages, in promises of inspiration to the sacred writers, in assertions of inspiration by the writers themselves, and in passages recognizing the union of human and divine authority. Taken altogether these proofs furnish unanswerable evidence in favor of the fact of inspiration,

but it is questionable whether they prove all that they are adduced to prove.

In part third the principal objections that have been urged against the Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration which the author endeavors to expound and establish, are briefly considered. Not only the difficulties in the way of its acceptance occasioned by certain Scripture statements and alleged discrepancies or mistakes, but also those springing from moral, critical, and scientific considerations, are noticed, and in a great measure removed. This part of the work is, however, too limited to be satisfactory.

As a whole the work is scholarly and judicious. It fairly states the views of those who differ from its author, and honestly answers their objections to the view maintained. It is written in an unusually clear and forcible style, and commends itself especially on the score of brevity. Though we cannot agree with the author on all points, yet we believe that the view which he advocates is substantially the correct one.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Marcus Dods, D.D., author of "The Book of Genesis," "The Parables of our Lord," "Israel's Iron Age," etc. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House. 1888. Price 75 cents.

This volume is one of the masterly series of convenient theological handbooks edited by Rev. W. Robertson Nicholl, M. A., and published under the title of "The Theological Educator." Those who have not the time and training necessary to the profitable study of a larger, Critical Introduction to the New Testament, and who yet desire to acquaint themselves with the history of the New Testament books and the critical theories advanced in regard to them, will find this book most admirably suited to their purpose. In a clear and concise form it presents just such information as every minister and every theological student should possess. Beginning with the Gospels, it treats, in regular order, of all the books of the New Testament. The history of each book, its author's aim in writing it, its noteworthy peculiarities, and the various, respectable, critical theories maintained with reference to it, are all given in a brief but intelligible manner. In it the latest views entertained concerning the New Testament writings will even be found noticed. For the correctness of its statements, its author's name is a sufficient guarantee.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. With Analyses and Illustrative Literature. By O. S. Stearns, D.D., Professor of Biblical Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co., Publishers, 50 Bromfield Street. 1888. Price, \$1.00.

This volume does for the Old Testament very much the same as that of Dr. Dods does for the New Testament. Its design, the author tells us in his preface, "is to enable the reader to find the

leading thoughts of each of the books of the Old Testament, combine these thoughts chronologically, as far as possible, and thus perceive more clearly and comprehensively their development." Such study of them, he believes, will lead to the appreciation of the saying of Tholuck, "Heathenism is the night-sky of religion, and the sky is sown with stars; Judaism is the moonlight, and Christianity the sun."

Though the book makes no claim to be anything more than a compendium of larger works on the same subject, yet it will be found very useful not only by theological students and ministers, but also by intelligent laymen, who would properly acquaint themselves with the contents of the Old Testament Scriptures. For, besides giving attention to the authorship, date, contents and chief difficulties of each of the books of these Scriptures, it also directs attention to such literature as may aid in the solution of the difficulties referred to. It is, indeed, just such a book as every one who would thoroughly acquaint himself with the contents of God's Word should have within easy reach. It is scarcely necessary to say that the work throughout gives evidence of superior scholarship as regards the subjects to which it relates.